Ernest R. Groves

The Family and Its Social Functions



Chicago Philadelphia New York

J. B. Lippincott Company

COPYRIGHT, 1940, BY J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the memory of my father

Henry Hunt Groves

who led me by his comradeship

into the riches of family life

Preface

THIS BOOK, *The Family and Its Social Functions*, differs both in purpose and content from *The American Family*. It is written with the conviction that study in the field of the family needs now to recognize two viewpoints, as became true in the development of sociology. The first texts introducing the student to the science mixed together an analysis and description of social experience with a discussion of the major problems of social life. In time, as the science matured, these two approaches separated. One can now enter upon study of the subject by a text concentrating upon sociological phenomena, or by one dealing with the pathology of society.

The author's former text, *The American Family*, emphasizes contemporary family problems in the United States, their causes, and the resources we have for dealing with them. This book, on the contrary, is concerned with the social purpose of the family, and American family life is used only as a source for illustrations.

A widespread interest in the study of the family is shown by the large enrollment in the courses on the family that are generally given either by the Department of Sociology or by the Department of Home Economics in American colleges and universities. The popularity of the introductory course, the increasing demand for instruction that will help to prepare the student for marriage and the family, and the greater desire of students to specialize in the field indicate that advanced courses in the family are now needed and will be welcomed by college students wherever offered. This text is designed for those students who want to continue the study of the family and go beyond a discussion of the problems of the family, its history, or a description of its activities.

The author has been in continuous contact for more than two decades through conference and correspondence with people who have sought counsel in order to deal with personal marriage or family problems, or in the effort to prevent difficulties from occurring. These confidences that he has been given, coming not only from all parts of this country, but from various countries of each continent, have both forced attention to every conceivable situation in marriage and family experience and have required, in the spirit of an applied art, the giving of specific information, diagnosis, and insight. The feeling of responsibility that these contacts have brought has led to a continuous dealing with the problems of marriage and family life that has encouraged thinking about the meaning both to the individual and to society of the family as a human experience. This latter interest has led to the writing of this book. It will soon be followed by an inductive approach to marriage based upon a liberal use of case material selected to illustrate the major problems of marriage and to stimulate the analytic thought of students in discussing them.

It will be useless to explain to some readers and fortunately needless to remind others that the last chapter of this book is not a statement of what the author wishes the future of the family to be, but an interpretation that attempts to look forward without regard to the feelings of either writer or reader.

As is always true in book-writing, and as the volume itself discloses, the author is indebted to a host of persons who have in one way or another contributed to its content. First of all, he wishes to acknowledge influences that have come from those who have by personal visitation or from a distance trusted him with the most intimate facts of their married or family life. Among the specific acknowledgments should come first the opportunity provided for the preparation of the book by the Institute for Research in Social Science, at the University of North Carolina, and to Howard W. Odum, its Director, for his constant interest and cooperation. Record also should be made of the interest shown in this undertaking and of the help

given in various ways by Dr. Katharine Jocher, Assistant Director of the Institute; Miss Georgia H. Faison, Reference Department, University of North Carolina Library; Dr. Phyllis Blanchard, Psychologist of the All-Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic; Dr. Olive M. Stone, of the William and Mary School of Social Work; Mrs. Ruth J. Wittmeyer; Reverend Edgar E. Schmiedeler, Director, Family Life Section, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington; Dr. Benjamin R. Andrews, Editor of this series; and my wife and co-worker, Gladys Hoagland Groves. The author also wishes to express appreciation of the interest and co-operation of Mrs. Ola Maie Foushee and Mrs. Virginia Gulledge in the preparation of the book.

E. R. G.

Contents

CHAPTER PAGE

I. *The Nature of the Family* 3

The concept "family." The family as a statistical unit. The family as an economic unit. The family as a social institution. Sociological interpretation. Family case study. The research approach. The art of family counseling. The family and society. Familial reality. Familial motivations. The family a conventionalized ideal. The changing family. Points of tension.

II. *Socialized Motives of the Family* 32

The meaning of motive. Society and motives. The fundamental psychic drives. Union of sex and reproduction. Sex as hunger. Sublimation of sex. The institution of marriage. Reproduction and marriage. A common element, co-operation. The power motivation. The home and the power urge. The social urge. Desire for social standing. The religious urge. Religion and the home.

III. *The Survival Functions of the Family* 62

Survival organization. Social evolution and survival. The larger meaning of survival. The family and biological survival. Ego survival. The family and social survival. Effects of economic co-operation. The family and group interests. Social survival and child training.

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. *The Incentive of Identity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period* 83

Incentives to domestic sentiments and activities. The incentive of identity. The birth process and identity. Identity in simple society. Family identity. Close contact and feelings of identity. Ancestors and domestic identity. Identity based on confidences. Totemic kinship. Blood brotherhood. Ancestor worship. Adoption identity. Milk ties. Sex kinship. Incest. The protest against "identical" matings. The sex attraction of the unfamiliar. The assumption of identity.

V. *The Incentive of Perpetuity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period* 113

Spread of kinship identity. Out-of-the-family pressure. The human craving for perpetuity. Perpetuity as a human desire. Some primitive expressions of perpetuity. Perpetuity and family experience. Society's use of family perpetuity. Family perpetuity and property. Family perpetuity and immortality. The contribution of sex to family perpetuity. Domestic perpetuity through fixation. Using the child for parental perpetuity. Domestic perpetuity through the growth of the child. Family perpetuity and environmental instability.

VI. *The Incentive of Transcendency and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period* 137

The construction of society. More than family co-operation. A continuous social process. The family contribution to society. The other-than-self motives. Mother love and the principle of other-than-self. Language and transcendency. Play and transcendency. Emotional maturity and love of others. Excesses of parent love. Vicarious transcendency.

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. *The Family Support of Culture* 162

Living as adjustment. Society, an extension of adjustment resources. Culture as increased resources. The family and material resources. The family and immaterial culture. The family and social introduction. Family influence and the unconscious. Social standardization. The family and the folkways. The family and the mores.

VIII. *The Family Support of Formal Institutions* . . . 180

The development of formal institutions. Survival and the formal institution. The child's entrance into institutional traditions. The child's own culture. Family co-operation and other institutions. The family and institutional variation. Concept and structure.

IX. *The Family Support of Government and Public Opinion* 196

Government as a social institution. Primitive government. The family's contribution to primitive government. The basis of governmental control. The family and maintenance of authority. The family trains as it functions. Domestic relationships vs. political relationships. The family and public order. The family and public opinion. The family an ally of social control. The family's judicial function. The family and the state.

X. *The Family Support of Education* 220

Education, a social necessity. The family and primitive education. Primitive education through nurture. Primitive curriculum. The family as a conditioning agency. The family curriculum. Vocational training. Moral and spiritual guidance. The family as the educating institution. The school as a formal institution. Family training a functional aspect. The child's reality. Education for family life. Sex education.

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. *The Family Support of Sex Status* 251

Masculine-feminine status. Natural trends toward domination. Masculine-feminine functioning. The reproductive cycle and division of labor. The social significance of woman's contribution. The fashioning of a social code. Child and sex status. The mother vs. the female. Antagonism between the sexes. The masculine code. Family conditioning by masculine-feminine status.

XII. *The Family Support of Religion* 273

The family and religion. Religion an extension of control. Familial motives for religion. Family experience and the development of religion. Phallic worship. The child's responses to religious stimuli. Religion and adolescence. The family and the church. The modern family and the church.

XIII. *Family Interactions* 290

The meaning of interaction. Interaction modifies behavior. Contact a prerequisite to interaction. The family and the significance of contact. Cursory contact and domestic relations. Contact and courtship interaction. Family contact a special association. The family and the individual. The individual in the family setting. Family association and inward response. Family association and outward response. The interacting family and its cultural setting. The family a social habit. Domestic security through mutual meaning. The domestic ideal.

XIV. *Emotional Characteristics of Family Experience* . 321

Meaning of emotion. Emotions as life-responses. The emotions as social adjustments. The significance of domestic attitude. The morbid attitude. The development of emotional traits. The domestic significance of childhood attitudes. The child's integrity and the domestic environment. The emotional exploitation of children. Pubic upheaval. Emotional change within the family.

CHAPTER PAGE

XV. *The Family and the Aggressive Mechanisms* . . 350

The family invitation. The family an incubator for emotion. The family and subjective maladjustments. The family and emotional maladjustments. Jealousy as emotion. Jealousy a liability of socialization. The child's jealousy due to replacement. Common incitements to childish jealousy. Studies of jealousy among children. Jealousy in courtship. Adult jealousy within the family. Jealousy as social motivation. Domestic dominance.

XVI. *The Family and the Defensive Mechanisms* . . 386

The family and emotional retreat. Liabilities of parental influence. Childhood overprotection and retreat. Fear and dependency. Childhood illness and protection. Marriage and family incentives to dependency relationships. Marriage and dependency. Inferiority feeling and marriage and the family. The analysis of inferiorities of domestic origin.

XVII. *The Clash of Loyalties within the Family* . . . 407

The meaning of loyalty. Loyalty within the family. The drive for loyalty. Ancestral loyalty. The ambivalent basis of clashing. Individualism and clashing. Childhood loyalties and their clashing. Adolescent clashing of loyalties. Parental clashing of loyalties. Matrimonial clashing of loyalties. The illusiveness of parenthood.

XVIII. *The Environmental Sensitiveness of the Family* . 441

The family and its environment. The physical environment. The family and inventions. The family and environmental adjustment. The family's sensitivity to change. Urbanization and the family. Urbanization, tension, and the family. Modern civilization and reproduction. Housing and the family. Significance of familial environments.

CHAPTER PAGE

XIX. *The Evolution of Social Thought Concerning the Family* 475

Religious leaders. The philosophers. The evolutionists. The anthropologists.

XX. *The Evolution of Social Thought Concerning the Family* (Continued) 520

The sociologists. The economists. The feminists. The radicals. The birth control movement. Freud and psychoanalysis. The sexologists. Education for marriage and the family. Legal thinking.

XXI. *The Future of the Family* 554

Permanence of familial functioning. The future of the family. The complexity of family changes. The sexual element of the family complex. The economic element of the family complex. The companionship element of the family complex. The parenthood element of the family complex. Future civilization and the family.

Appendix 595

Index of Names 613

General Index 619

THE FAMILY AND ITS SOCIAL FUNCTIONS

I. *The Nature of the Family*

THE CONCEPT "FAMILY." The term "family" is used to designate that portion of human experience which has resulted from the enlarging, refining, and lengthening of the behavior that among the higher animals gathers about reproduction and care of offspring. Both of these activities have as their biological purpose the survival of the species, and thus stand in contrast with those that grow out of the needs of the individual organism as it attempts to fulfill its own career.[1] Reproduction and nurture as functions on the human level have achieved a quantitative and qualitative extension which makes them, in the length of time during which they operate and in the meaning which they have, distinguishable from what takes place on lower organic levels. This does not mean that sex or care of offspring is among all animals simple and stereotyped or, at least in the case of domestic animals, so rigidly held to an instinctive routine as not to allow individual variation even to the perversion or disappearance of the appropriate, instinctive behavior. It is rather that the evolution of sex and the parent-offspring relationship have taken on among human beings a characteristic complexity as a result of the psychic advancement, including self-consciousness and the radical release from instinct-determined conduct made possible by the richer nervous endowment of man.

Neither among animals nor among men and women does familial experience assume a universal, standard expression. Instead there is great variety, and the common meaning in this diversity must be found not in the form or content of the ex-

[1] H. S. Jennings, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature*, p. 254.

perience but in its purpose or function. The psychic resources of men and women have so extended both reproduction and nurture as to tend to conceal their basic biological aims. Both interests on the human level have been developed to a point where they seem to have cut adrift from the original survival program and to have gathered new and independent values. Always, however, the primary meaning of the human family must be found in the services it renders in the two basic functions that it shares with the other higher animals. The peculiar significance of human sex and nurture, therefore, appears in their wealth of content, their particular complexity, rather than in any distinctive biological purpose.

The family as a statistical unit

Although as a concept "the family" is one of our firmest ideas, it becomes under analysis a generalization. The reality from which we draw our term is multiple and diverse. There are families, but "the family" is a concept. The family may be interpreted as a statistical unit. We can then arbitrarily establish it by definition. This permits us to classify and catalogue selected features of individual families and arrive at enumerations, comparisons, and trends indispensable for the understanding of certain aspects of familial experience. When, however, we seek to find the family in operation, we must pass from the general to the particular and inspect some individual family, unique in its significance to its members and therefore in its essential character; and this reality of the individual family alone holds, even if the case considered is most conventional in time and place and readily may be grouped with other families sharing similar traits that reflect a common environment. To rule out the particularity of familial experience means casting aside the very qualities that make the family a life-experience. On the other hand, neglect of those elements that can be separated, defined, and counted as a means of gaining insight into certain family activities would disregard the com-

mon objective facts that give substance to the concept "the family."

The variability of the definition of the family as a statistical unit is such that, in any specific study of the family, there is always need of a precise statement of the meaning of the term. For instance, the census enumerator requires a clear ruling as to what is meant by the individual family; he must know who is to be included and who excluded. An example of this is the following instruction:

> Thus, if a member of any family in your district is temporarily away from home on a visit, or on business, or traveling for pleasure, or attending school or college, or sick in a hospital, such absent person should be enumerated and included with the other members of the family. But a son or daughter permanently located elsewhere should not be included with the family.[2]

If, however, a family is so defined as to include any group of persons, whether related or not, living together as one household and usually sharing the same table, the statistical unit may be a boardinghouse, an orphanage, or even a single person living alone. Such a statistical unit leads in any investigation to a very different result from that secured when the family is described as a group of persons living together and having a marital or a parent-child relationship.[3] It is evident that the statistical unit, whatever form it takes, cannot be "the family." It is instead a standard of measurement by means of which various facts belonging to a multitude of individual families can be brought under a common classification, thus permitting an exact enumeration of selected features of familial experience.

The family as an economic unit

The importance of the family as an economic unit for survival is such, especially among some primitive groups existing

[2] U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Instructions to Enumerators* (Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920), p. 16.

[3] Day Monroe, *Chicago Families*, p. 8.

on a low level of culture, that this aspect of familial activity needs to be recognized in any description of the specific functioning of the institution. The means of livelihood is so thoroughly tied up with the life of the home that the family seems to be an organization for carrying on the economic system. In such a setting, the contribution of the family as a cooperative means of obtaining subsistence is such as to suggest that economic motive played an important part in developing the family as an institution. Of that there can be no doubt; and, as later discussion will point out, not only did the kinship group furnish a natural association for the working together that physical existence required, but this experience of sharing common and pressing interests brought about a deepening of the meaning of kinship.

The economic function of the family has been emphasized by both social philosophers and scientists again and again in their discussions of the institution. No one has stressed this part of the family more than the famous French social student, Frédéric Le Play. He made the family unit basic in his sociological studies, and the budget became for him the key to the activities of the family. He made it the starting point in his analyses. He even went so far as to say that by gaining a full knowledge of the income and expenditures of a particular family, one obtained a complete knowledge of that family. His classification of the different types of family organization is based upon the significance he found in the family budget.[4]

The economic function has always been so prominent in the history of the family as an institution that its recognition is indispensable in any description of familial experience. The economic and the social are so woven together that on low levels of culture, at least, it seems arbitrary to deal with them separately. Margaret G. Reid has given us a brief but illuminating survey of household production in the past.[5] She summarizes

[4] C. C. Zimmerman, "The Family Budget as a Tool for Sociological Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 33, pp. 903-907.

[5] Margaret G. Reid, *Economics of Household Production*, chap. 2.

her findings as follows: Households have never been entirely self-sufficing. Individual families have always found it an advantage to co-operate with others and make use of their superior specialization. However, even when the households were not actually self-sufficient, they were often potentially able to care for themselves. Household production tends to be important in agricultural communities possessing simple equipment, limited transportation and communication, and in families greatly isolated.

The individual family is not likely to attain great self-sufficiency unless it stands apart from the productivity and consumption of other larger social groups. An illustration of this statement of the author is the communistic economic system of the Maori.[6] In this instance, it is necessary, however, to distinguish between the economic meaning of the greater family and the significance of kinship as a source of common sentiment in the smaller individual family.[7] The advantage of co-operation between households led to the establishment of social customs that encouraged one family to assist another. There appears to be in the history of household production no evidence of conscious social effort to direct such family activities. Men had a less important place in household production than women, who have been the principal workers. Men, on the other hand, have taken a larger part than women in the co-operative program of groupings larger than the individual family.[8]

It is generally recognized that as a result of the modern industrial development there has been a decrease in the importance of the family as an economic unit. Out-of-the-home employment, frequently for both the man and the woman, has in a multitude of instances put an end to household production of the type so characteristic of most families in the past. How-

[6] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, pp. 102-110.

[7] *Ibid*, pp. 104-105.

[8] Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

ever, this does not mean that the economic importance of the family has been destroyed, but rather that its form of contribution has been altered. Consumptive activities in a large sense have generally replaced productive undertakings; but although the family has lost the great part it once played when household production provided the means of livelihood, it still remains an economic unit.[9]

The family as a social institution

When we approach family behavior from the point of view of its significance for the social or group life, the home becomes a social institution. This concept is selective in its emphasis. Attention is placed upon the common structural features belonging to a definite group of families. A social institution is the creation of folkways that have, over a sufficient length of time, issued in a relatively formal, persistent, group-approved, systematic routine of social practices. Sumner, to whom we owe our original insight into the significance of early primitive experience, divides social institutions into two types:[10] The *crescive* is the fruitage of instinctive efforts finally taking form in a conventional social pattern. The *enacted* institution, on the contrary, is a deliberate creation of rational invention and intention. When we apply this distinction to the family institution, it is clear that from the viewpoint of origin it falls into the first classification, although the variety of family forms among primitive peoples shows the enactment factor at work. This explanation of the coming of the family as a social institution must not be interpreted so as to deny the influence in a highly developed society of deliberately directed programs to change the conditions of an existing family type, even when the prevailing form represents an evolution of the folkways.

The rapid reconstruction that has taken place in the Turkish family[11] since the World War of 1914-18 is illustrative of the

[9] B. R. Andrews, *The Economics of the Household*, p. 8.
[10] W. G. Sumner, *Folkways*, p. 54.
[11] Ruth F. Woodsmall, *Moslem Women Enter a New World.*

enacted contribution that can be made to the family as a social institution by legislation, by education, or by a purposely organized imitation. The fact that this reforming of the family as a Moslem institution was influenced by the structure and function of the family in western Europe, products in their turn of folkways developments, does not change the fact that the family reconstruction in Turkey was an enacted modification. In the modern world the operation of both crescive and enacted influences can be detected working on the family, and much of the instability of contemporary domestic life originates from their collision.

Sociological interpretation

The social significance of the family is so great and so evident that from the beginning of the modern science of sociology the family, both as a social institution and as a grouping of domestic experience, has had attention and emphasis. If we think of sociology as starting with Auguste Comte, which is conventional, we find the founder of the modern science, in spite of his scanty knowledge of primitive life and his own domestic unhappiness, making the family the unit and bulwark of society. If we extend sociological interests backward so as to include classic philosophy, we discover that both Plato and Aristotle thought of the family as the fundamental influence over human life.

The family has been interpreted as a major topic in every systematic analysis of society. It also has been treated as a specific topic in a quantity of sociological literature. The tendency in this latter presentation has been toward two opposite points of view. In one, problems of the family have had chief attention, and in the other exploration of its normal functioning. Some of these studies of family problems have been such as to deserve the designation *pathology of the family*, while others have been descriptions of the difficulties unescapable in the most wholesome of homes.

In the United States the attention the family began to receive early in the present century as an independent topic chiefly appeared in discussions of its problems. More recently, in part as a result of the impact of the aggressive, modern, diagnostic development of psychiatry, there have appeared studies of the family of the second type suggested, giving a more functional portrayal of the family and showing a greater interest in the familial experience of individuals, especially in regard to its emotional significance. This tendency the sociologists share with the anthropologists, the psychiatrists, the economists, and the professional social workers. Even medicine, in its therapeutic program, has felt the need of the reinforcement of a special type of social work service which has stressed the functional meaning of the family as related to disease and convalescence.[12] Clearer understanding, gained by various sciences, of the lasting influence of childhood upon the adult career has added incentive to increase our knowledge of the family as a going concern that carries unrivaled emotional consequences, and to apply our insight to every kind of social or psychic maladjustment.

Modern medicine has been driven to a clearer realization of the effect of emotion upon physiological processes and its contribution to ill health. The connection between emotion and disease is not a one-way, but a reciprocal, relationship. The disordered functioning of the body affects the emotions, and they in turn strengthen the disease.[13] The strain of modern life is to be found chiefly in the emotional reactions of the body that accompany our psychic sensitiveness and expenditure of energy.[14] Certain diseases appear especially as products of the emotional stress.[15]

Medical social work functions in the effort to get at the

[12] Richard Cabot, *Social Service and the Art of Healing;* Harriet M. Bartlett, *Medical Social Work.*

[13] A. F. Riggs, "The Significance of Illness," chap. 4, in *The Physician and His Patient* (L. Eugene Emerson, editor).

[14] George Crile, *Diseases Peculiar to Civilized Man,* pp. 26-27.

[15] *Ibid.,* pp. 24-25.

meaning to the individual of his illness, and rarely do we find the family taking a small place in the complex influences that bring about what has been called the social component of illness.[16] Even when other than domestic explanations are given for the situation—for illustration, the feeling of economic insecurity—we find that the family has a prominent place in the causation. Thus, in the example given, emotions that do most to make insecurity significant may have their source in worry over wife or children, or may come from a trait of personality resulting from poverty in childhood.

Family case study

We gather another insight as to the meaning of the family by looking at the institution from a case-study point of view. This is the interpretation of the professionally trained social worker who attempts a sympathetic but objective understanding of a concrete family situation, including its characteristics, the personalities of the members, the environmental factors that play upon the home, and the forces coming out from the past that affect each member in the intimacy and help to form the family routine. The family thus viewed becomes a unique delineation of human causation, a revelation of human behavior as it pivots about a central interest. Family case study is a penetration into family experience which is both analytic and synthetic, and which seeks to give a portrayal through a case history similar to that which the family-problem novel tries to produce in art.

The case record of a family provides a brief, revealing, concrete, domestic history, and presents a picture of the individual home investigated which is unlike the family life as realized by any individual inmate or as conceived by neighbor and outsider. Case-work portrayal of a family leaves one with a diagnostic sense of the power and problem of familial contact. Each person emerges as an individual who, as a result of a veritable bombardment of stimuli during the formative period of

[16] Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

his personality, has absorbed basic character traits. The family seems a clustering point, having meaning of its own and at the same time becoming an interaction through common contact and response. The focus around which the interacting personalities move may be stressed, or there may be a serial emphasis on the career of each person brought into the relationship.

As a result of advances in the understanding of human behavior, especially in the psychological and psychiatric sciences, there has recently developed in the field of social work a better technique for the interpretation of family experience. The tendency has been to move away from thinking of the problem of the client, even in the family situation, and toward the exploring of each person in difficulty so as to get at the drift of a long-time career whose meaning appears when it is looked upon as a whole.[17] This more dynamic approach gives added emphasis to the influences of the family both through the formative period of childhood and the existing and developing kinship conditions as they appear in the interaction of all the persons concerned on the adult level.

The research approach

Another way of entering the meaning of the family is to follow its ramifications as a subject of research. At once it is apparent that the family cannot be squeezed into any particular science, but that it ranges over an extensive field from anthropology to biology and from sociology to economics. The area is too wide for any single investigator. As a consequence, research tends to branch in two directions. Either we have an interpretation of the family from the viewpoint of a single science such as sociology, for example, or we have an attempt to follow some particular problem as it comes to expression within the field of the family, even though the forces operating fall

[17] Virginia P. Robinson, *A Changing Psychology in Social Case Work*, p. 104; Maurice Karpf, *The Scientific Basis of Social Work*, pp. 1-10.

into the territories of different sciences. An illustration of the latter would be the attempt to trace the causes of a falling birth rate in a definite community.

Nearly always a complete attack upon any particular problem of the family needs the co-operative, co-ordinated investigation of several specialists. Nowhere in the entire field of social science is this more clear.[18] Rarely, indeed, will a thoroughgoing investigation keep itself within the social sciences, since often conditions existing there lead, when causal understanding is sought, into the physical sciences.

This vast extension of the family as it appears to the eyes of the researcher naturally has led to the limiting of even specific family problems so that a portion of their significance, falling within a definite specialty, may be handled with only slight attention to the ramifications that carry it into other fields of investigation.

The art of family counseling

In addition to the science of the family, we have the application of our gathered knowledge as an art. Just as there is the science of anatomy and its application in surgery, and the science of nutrition and its application in the art of cooking, so there is a point of view of the family that must not be disregarded that develops from experience in dealing with various sorts of domestic problems. This comes nearest to science in the particular type of service which is furnished by clinics, social work organizations, and especially qualified individuals. This service is not new; in one way or another it has been provided for a long time. In our culture at first it was chiefly the responsibility of ministers and doctors. Men in these professions still continue to give counsel to persons in domestic difficulties. Charles Darwin has said of his father that not only did he have a considerable amount of this kind of practice, but that he had

[18] Howard W. Odum and Katharine Jocher, *An Introduction to Social Research*, pp. 79-81.

come from experience to know when his patient sought medical help and when he, or oftener she, wanted the chance to talk over some family problem and get advice that could be trusted.[19]

Philanthropic organizations from their beginning in this country tended to include in some form in their programs recognition of family difficulties, and to provide a degree of family counseling. Recently, however, there has been a greater emphasis upon this type of service and a new attention to its technique, and, since the World War of 1914-18, a rapid growth both in the desire for guidance in marriage and family life and in the development of resources to meet the demands. The latter has taken many forms, but the trend has been toward a definite social specialty.[20]

He who deals with concrete family situations for the purpose of giving counsel, whatever his scientific background, finds himself taking the role of the physician who, drawing upon his medical background, attempts to use knowledge and skill in healing. Just as the gathering of insight from a wide and diversified medical practice is an art quite unlike the scientific technique of the investigator confined to the laboratory, so the handling of concrete domestic cases becomes an art in the field of the family. Just as the doctor comes to understand sick people by actually trying to help them, so the family counselor gains an understanding of marriage, of parenthood, of family motives and conditions, and this familiarity issues in an attitude of sympathy and comprehension that can never come from mere study. He soon discovers that maladjustments take every conceivable form, and that there is no limit to the forms tension can take or to the variations of individual reactions. This approach of the practitioner in the domestic sphere makes its contribution to our understanding of the nature of the family.

[19] F. Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, p. 12.

[20] Ralph P. Bridgman, "Guidance for Marriage and Family Life," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*, vol. 160, pp. 144-164.

Anyone who carries on the art of family counseling and who does not keep himself steeped in the constantly appearing literature of the science of the family is bound to be superficial and dogmatic in his advice-giving. The scientist, on the other hand, who does not have close personal contact with people in trouble in marriage and home relationships is handicapped, for he misses the restraining influences that appear with the responsibility of giving people insight and practical guidance in concrete, realistic situations. A firsthand knowledge of the difficulties that people meet in their family relationships helps protect him from two dangers that always arise in the analysis of human conduct.

He cannot easily develop the habit of interpreting matrimonial and familial problems as products of simple causation. He is forced to realize that although diagnosis may be stated in simple causal classifications, this is certain to be a verbal rather than a revealing description. The art of counseling also teaches the student of marriage and the family to look away from the domestic tension and toward the persons in trouble, for only so is it possible to get the understanding needed to help them. Seldom can one go searching through any experience of incompatibility or harmful intimacy in either marriage or the home without being impressed by the great and often the dominating importance of the personalities involved. Even if these are creations primarily of former familial influences—and seldom is the causation so simple—it matters not. In an existing maladjustment the task of the adviser is not the manipulation of exterior circumstances so much as it is a changing of the fundamental life-attitudes of the people involved. Attempts to lead people to achieve these character alterations make one wary of descriptions of matrimonial or familial associations that are abstract, formal, or exclusively structural interpretations.

The family and society

Whatever approach one makes to the family, evidence accumulates not only that society as it operates through various

group organizations turns over to the family certain responsibilities, but also that society itself has been developed through familial experience and is still largely supported by contributions from the home. Recent thought has been so centered upon the problems of the family or upon the functioning of the family when looked upon as a social unit, that there has been a relative neglect of the greater significance of the family in bringing and maintaining society. This neglect is revealed when one notices how small a place the child has been given in the various attempts to present a systematic account of social phenomena.

When we think of the processes that produce the experiences which we generalize under the term "society," it seems strange that the adult has had so much attention and the child so little in the science of sociology. When society is conceived as a functioning process, a continuous ongoing in a way suggestive of the individual consciousness which carries the past into the present and establishes purposes directed toward the future, it is certain that the relationship of adult with child has in this cultural flow a more pregnant meaning than the contact of adult with adult. Even in the association of adults, however, the fundamental framework of the personalities in interaction must be traced back to a domestic origin.

It is the purpose of this book to deal with the family not in its inner working as this stands by itself, as was true in *The American Family*, but to seek in familial experience a considerable portion of the structure, the incentive, and the energy of society. Just as an organ of the body may be studied with emphasis upon its independence, or may be interpreted from its effect upon the body taken as a whole and the influences of the latter upon it, so the family may be given the narrower or the wider analysis. The neglect that the family has received in sociological thinking from this point of view reveals how largely the sociological systems have been logical rather than functional and dynamic. Any attempt to appraise the family justly as a fundamental source of social phenomena elevates the

importance of the child and the by-products of the nurture-period during which parent and offspring are in reciprocal emotional relationship. As causal experiences this association reveals itself best if we enter it through the child's developing career and trace the inflowing of the substances of his personality during his formative years as he increasingly takes on social character. Next in importance to the child is, as a rule, the mother, who is also carried toward a greater social career by the effect the child has upon her and the responses she makes to his demands. Since the mother's relationship has such strong roots in biologically established impulses and processes, perhaps it is the father who has chiefly profited socially by the experiences of parenthood. Even the husband-wife relationship may take on a new meaning with the coming of the child, since the parents' mutual commitment to their offspring may and commonly does act as a maturing and socializing influence.

Familial reality

The content of the family is made up of personal experience tied together by the recognition of a peculiar relationship among the members of an individual family. Although each person in the association lives his unique career even in the common contact, there is a feeling of belonging to an inimitable alliance, with a possession of collective interests, which is not weakened by the fact that the role each plays in the family enterprise is as individual as the contribution each makes and the reaction each takes from the life of all the members together. This feeling of belonging to one another is, to an outside analyst, not unlike the reaction of persons in fellowship in any closely knit organization. Nevertheless, as subjective experience, it has a quality that makes it stand out from any other social belonging. There are many reasons for this distinguishable feature, and the purpose of this book is to analyze them and see how they operate to make the family a social organization unlike any other institution.

The essence of that which binds together the members of a concrete family is kinship. This means that the forces operating upon human nature to bring forth a sense of family relationship can best be catalogued under the term "kinship." It is so closely tied to our notion of the family that it seems almost a synonym. Kinship is, however, the wider idea, and the form a family takes decides how much of distant kinship is included. The orthodox Chinese family, for example, may assume a unity that includes a large number of remote kindred,[21] while an American family may be reduced to two members—husband and wife. Along with both of these organizations, however, we may find a weaker sense of kinship that ties the individuals composing the family to other existing families. If we analyze the American illustration, we find husband and wife related by kinship to the preceding families from which they broke away at marriage, families whose ties they feel in strong or faint degree; and we find still other more distant connections, to the uncles, for example, that are likely to be still weaker because they are relationships stretching beyond the allegiances that formerly constituted the vital kinship of the husband and of the wife who make up the existing family. Thus we have gradations of *belonging* spreading outward from the husband and wife to include first the parents, brothers, and sisters of each, and then the more distant circle—uncles, aunts, cousins, and finally persons whose kinship becomes so slight a connection emotionally as not to have genuine significance. An illustration of this is the attitude of interest in persons with the same surname as oneself, even if entire strangers, that many people feel, and their practice on meeting such a person of inquiring as to possible kinship. The meaning of kinship is also further complicated by the fact that each member of the family selected for illustration marries into a status of belonging to the kinships of the other. The wife's adopted kinship to her husband's family is weaker than the natural kinship to her own, and his

[21] D. H. Kulp, II, *Country Life in South China.*

is similarly graduated to her family and to his own. We cannot, therefore, use the word "kinship" as a synonym for "the family," unless the latter term is given an unusual genetic meaning.

It is an advantage to recognize Grosse's distinction between the individual family made up of parents[22] and children based upon the code of a lasting exclusive marriage relationship of the parents, the characteristic type of family wherever Western culture prevails, and the great family composed of parents and children and all their descendants with their families so far as they have not been separated from it by marriage or some other event. The Chinese family is our best modern example of this second type of family. In both forms kinship provides the basis of the relationship, but in one it is narrowly interpreted and in the other broadly. How contrary the great family *(Grossfamilie)* is to our conventions appears in the press report that an American woman has just been given a divorce because after her marriage the relatives of her husband began to crowd in upon her, until finally more than a dozen "in-laws" were living in her household and her husband refused to send them away. What in China would seem commonplace appears to the Western reader an impossible matrimonial situation. Dr. Paul Monroe reports the case of a young Chinese scholar appointed to a university faculty, whose relatives forthwith came to live with him in this honorable status.

The sort of experience in kinship that gives substance to family relationships is a product of the conditions of human infancy. We have known since the days of John Fiske[23] that the human child's longer period of helplessness in comparison with the nurture period of even the higher animals made possible the later greater endowments and achievements of the human adult. As we travel downward in the animal scale we find organisms requiring less and less time for preparation for adult life because they act during their entire career more and more mechanically, and their instinctive behavior has no need of a

[22] G. E. Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions*, vol. 1, p. 61.
[23] "The Progress from Brute to Man," *North American Review*, Oct., 1873.

complex nervous foundation. As compared with organisms on all lower planes, the human infant is supremely helpless and dependent. This lengthening of the period of growth is clearly not only a biological but also a social evolution. The more the cultural resources of civilization accumulate, the greater the need of carrying the infancy period, in the sense of preparation for adult life, even beyond the time which the physical organism of man requires for its full development. The approximately twenty-year span between the time of physical weaning and the maturation of personality that we describe as psychological and sociological weaning is evidence of the importance of the function of the family in socializing the individual and personalizing society, an importance which sociological science up to the present has strangely neglected.

This situation of infancy has a double meaning. If it brings to the child survival by a long-time nurture carried on by his parents, it at the same time tends to develop in both the mother and the father those emotional attitudes that have come to constitute the parental character. These are frequently interpreted as expressions of the same instinct that insures the mother-regard for offspring among the higher animals; but although this is their original evolutionary basis, what we find on the human level shows the additions through cultural experience that have carried the mother-child relationship far from its nearest animal semblance. The father-child relationship goes through a similar educational development making the father of the infant, the five-year-old, the high-school graduate, and the fully launched adult "child," himself a demonstration of social evolution and a depository of deepening personal experience that has profound significance for society. Much of the drive of the peace movement among older men and women, for example, may stem from parental regard for adult children long since psychologically and socially weaned. Knowledge of the instinctive behavior of animals impresses one with the strength of the prehuman maternal and paternal impulses, but also convinces one that the content of parental feeling, as it appears in men and women, is

a new achievement which has lost in rigidity but gained in both spread and depth.

The mere expansion of the infancy period gives us no explanation of the development that led man away from the instinct-limitations of the animal. It furnished the opportunity; the change itself becomes intelligible only as we look upon it as a product of growth-possibilities, incentives, and environmental contacts. It followed the routine of all social processes, but because of the formative period in which it operated in the life of the child, the responses it evoked and the effect of these on the mother, it brought forth a new significance in the relationship of infant and adult. The mother, for example, not only loved her offspring longer and more; her ties with her child because of this lengthening and strengthening of affection added quality as well as quantity to the experience of parenthood. This accretion in turn permitted the coming of incentives, born of the relationship, that gave parenthood a new and different meaning.

When we consider this development as an evolutionary process, the family appears as the incubator of qualities of personality that, as they grow, strengthen and widen the family as a relationship, and these accretions in turn still more vitalize and deepen the parental attitudes. Thus the process goes on reciprocally with constant psychic and social accumulations until this growth in human attributes becomes in quality and range a new socio-biological creation.

The value of the longer infancy period is in its provision of opportunity for freer and fuller adjustments by the child and for an enrichment of the meaning of kinship for both child and adult. As a consequence, childhood constitutes the chief determining period of the human career, with the family outrivaled in its power during the growth process only by heredity, while the adult, acting as a parent, builds upon his own child-made foundation his most mature traits of personality.

Our knowledge that the infancy period has made possible the evolution of distinctive human traits tells us where to look for

the purpose of the family, but this does not uncover the working of the processes that brought the family into being, maintain it, and still provide it with function. What we need is not a statement but an unraveling of the forces associated with this lengthening of the nurture period of human beings, that, in alliance with an increasing nervous equipment, led to the characteristic association we call "the family." If the longer helplessness of the child opened up a favorable occasion for the development of a different and more complex parent-offspring relationship, the forces that produced this relationship must be found in human motivations as these were influenced by an advancing cultural environment. Man's quest for satisfaction brought changes that affected the nurture period; these were in turn themselves worked upon by the greater meaning in the parent-offspring association they had brought about.

An explanation of the process as the operation of instinct cannot be made in a way that closes the door to personality expansion on the human level, for this widening of the meaning of parenthood did in fact occur. The use of the word "instinct" in any explanation of human behavior is apt to be ambiguous.[24] The term appears constantly in psychiatric literature but is never used as a concept for rigid routine practices, for to give it in such writings the meaning it carries when applied to animal activities would sterilize the science itself. The ape, the animal nearest to man, reveals a degree of variability suggesting what we find on the human level, but nothing that permits the subtleties of interpretation psychiatry has developed, not only regarding the conduct of the adult but also of the child. Even when parenthood is defined as instinctive, it is not denied, in its human expression, content and quality that are both more than and different from what the nurture period yields among the animals.

The accretions of length and of learning to the infancy period, the additions of its emotional meaning to both child and

[24] L. L. Bernard, *Instinct: A Study in Social Psychology*, chaps. 7-20.

parent, and the lessening of automatic procedure as the dominance of instinct faded, must be thought of as occupying a tremendous passage of time during which there was an awakening of new motivations as a result of progress that had already taken place. The development must have been similar to that of the individual musical career, in which one achievement makes possible another.

Failure to recognize this has sent scientists interested in the origin of the family upon a futile search. Effort has been made repeatedly to get back to the historical beginning of the human family, and always this endeavor has led to unconvincing conclusions. It has been found that even people living a simple social life as compared with ours do not have necessarily a primitive type of marriage or a slight family experience. An example of this is the native Australians, who, although they maintained a meager culture, carried on a highly complex marriage relationship that requires careful definition if it be correctly described.

Neither the evolutionary deductions nor the historical evidence yields clues that permit their locating in time the birthday of the family. This is no discrimination against familial experience, because it is likewise with all our fundamental social institutions. If we could discover the simplest family that has existed within the period of transmitted records, it would surely not be the first human form of family life, even though it might be nearer to that than is anything we now know. The coming of the family was not an episode; it was a process. To get any appreciation of this process, it is necessary to explore as best we can the significance of the parent-child relationship and to detect what this has done to human nature. This requires the searching of motivations less mature than those normally present in modern men and women and now operating in family association. It clouds our understanding of the family to seek a time origin of the home rather than to look for its incentives as they grew out of the relationship familiar to us through the behavior of the higher animals.

Familial motivations

The motivations that led to a new order in the domestic sphere must be still continuing and acting upon our existing type of familial experience. From this viewpoint the changing family is a family in the process of being remade. It has not passed beyond evolutionary influences, even though these are necessarily modified both in content and expression because they must find expression within a highly complex environment. Merely to assign the influences that have worked to bring the family to the lengthening infancy period, without any effort to trace in detail what has occurred in the process, yields little understanding of the modern family as a functioning social institution.

It is at least an advantage to recognize clearly the nature of the problem that faces the serious student of the family. To gain insight not only as to the beginning but also as to the present existence of the family, there must be a sounding of human nature, a searching out of the incentives that would tend to add to the meaning of the child to the parent, and which in turn would make the parent more consequential to the child.

Along with this social process went continuously an increasing use of the nervous equipment which made possible the cultural changes. Merely, however, to point out that there was a longer brain development as animal life moved toward the human does not reveal how this advantage of a more complex organism showed itself in an increased psychic and social experience as it affected parent-child association. The opportunity provided by the better brain made possible greater parental functioning, and a different family structure was the result. This functional analysis of the family, fundamental as it is, does not exhaust the significance of the institution. Although in the pages that follow this approach to the uncovering of the meaning of the family will be emphasized, there will be recognition of other centers of interest in the investigation and interpretation of familial experience.

This individual growth naturally proceeds in a family with children. It might be thought, therefore, that the childless family would be entirely destitute of these maturing influences and ought not to be regarded as a family at all. It was this that led to Melvin M. Knight's[25] invention of the word "companionate" as a term to describe a family different from that which we regard as the normal, a concept spoiled by its later use as a synonym for a relationship that is best described as trial marriage. The fact that the companionate marriage was interpreted as a genuine although different family experience made clear Dr. Knight's conviction that the childless home was something more than the mere living together in matrimony of a man and a woman.

Social suggestion, the product of the evolution previously described, affects the experience of marriage even when no children result, so that there is at least a slight potential parenthood-element that makes the union something more than a mere licensing of sexual compatibility. Not only is there in such a marriage the ever present possibility in most cases of the coming of a child, but attitudes that would not normally go along with a man-mistress association are carried over into the fellowship, and these become in many cases, if not in all, a substitution for the parental impulses that are denied their appropriate outlet. In numerous instances the dog, for example, replaces the child. In even more cases the vocation accumulates values and emotional meaning that are stimulated by the void created by lack of parental opportunity. Certainly it would be an undeveloped marriage relationship that possessed nothing more than the marital adjustment and the personal comradeship of husband and wife. Thus an arrested type of family profits in some degree from the atmosphere of parent-child relationship that has be-

[25] "The Companionate and the Family—the Unobserved Division of an Historical Institution," *Journal of Social Hygiene*, vol. 10, pp. 257-267; H. E. Fosdick, "What Is Happening to the American Family?" *Journal of Social Hygiene*, vol. 15, pp. 139-151; E. R. Groves, *The Drifting Home* and *The Marriage Crisis;* B. B. Lindsey and W. Evans, *The Companionate Marriage;* J. K. Folsom, *The Family*, pp. 358-360, 410-411.

come so tied to our thought and feeling about marriage through the long-time working of social heredity that it makes the living together of childless married couples an experience distinguishable from any other male-female association. It is difficult for such persons, however deliberate their childless program, to escape reacting in some manner to the conventional ideal of the family.

The family a conventionalized ideal

The full significance of the family is lost unless it is recognized that the domestic association has significance beyond its actual expressions. A mere portrayal of what happens in a family would conceal a part of the meaning of the intimacy to those living together. There is an underlying feeling associated with the concept "family" that influences all who share the experience, giving them a conventionalized ideal. In the mind of each, leaving out of account the exceptions represented by those who at this point are socially peculiar or deficient, there is a recognition, usually vague and emotional, of the standard "ideal family"; and the occurrences in the concrete family are interpreted in the light of this concept and gather a meaning because of it that otherwise they would not have. Frequently this idea of "the family" carries back to the childhood experiences of the adult and forward through imagination to future expectation in the minds of his children. Always, however, we detect in the idea contemporary influences from many quarters that help to create the ideal.

The idealized family becomes a source of incentive tending to mold the family roles according to the conventions of the time. It, however, also may lead to criticism of the life found in any actual family, to discontent, and at times of transition, when the conventions are inconsistent, to family instability. The feelings that accompany and give force to the ideal are too subtle in most persons to be carried over to a precise definition of what is the ideal family, but in spite of this indefiniteness of

portraiture the notion affects behavior and must be considered in any analysis of the meaning of the family.

The changing family

Whether the family is dealt with from the point of view of its functions or its problems, investigation always emphasizes its changing character. Although conventional thought, and especially emotion as it conceives the ideal family, tends to picture something final and complete, serious study of familial experience discloses that the family is subject to the same changing that is characteristic of all social organizations. There are great differences in the momentum of this change, ranging from very little and very slow variation in relatively static societies to such rapid, multiple trends in periods of transition as to give the impression of great disorganization. The swift flow of culture in the twentieth century has markedly affected the family, and wherever modern civilization has pervaded there has been so much mutability as to attract wide attention.

It is a mistake to think that the changing so characteristic of contemporary family life is something new to human experience. The situation at present is different from what it has been in former times, but this is because the momentum of social life itself has increased in rapidity, with the result that changes not only in the family but in every aspect of social life occur with unprecedented swiftness. The ethnologists, to be sure, describe family systems that appear to be hardened into immobility. Even were it true that they represented a finality of content, function, and structure, this would mean an arrest of a development that had previous history and therefore had reached fixity by earlier changes as the group attempted to adjust itself to environmental circumstances. As a matter of fact, however, the difference between former family experience and the present is relative. Until now, family reshaping has gone forward with slow motion, sometimes with such slow motion that it would be necessary to retrace a long period of evolutionary development

to realize that there had been any movement at all. In contrast, in our time change is taking place with an acceleration human nature has never before encountered.

The family is attempting to keep pace with this unprecedented changeableness of the material environment, and the effort disorganizes it as a social institution. The fact, however, that the family has lost functions that in the past could not be successfully carried on unless the family kept pace with related conditions in the prevailing environment suggests that the family must recover its stability by greater emphasis upon functions it still possesses that satisfy human need rather than by attempting to make adaptation directly to external circumstances. As will appear in a later discussion, this does not mean that the family must withdraw from the world and save itself by isolation from its modern environment, but rather that its stability must come not from subserviency to external occurrences but by developing and maintaining values that permit a discriminating adjustment. These grow increasingly significant because they protect not the social institution but man himself by lessening the inner disturbance commonly resulting from a rapidity of environmental change so great that human nature has not yet learned to build the necessary prophylactic.

The family has been so confused in various periods of the past that the recent contemporary pessimism regarding its ability to carry on has been duplicated in expressions that have become material for the historian, who finds in them not only evidence in some degree of domestic maladjustment but also of the fact of environmental change. Looking back as we do from a time when the family is struggling with the difficulties of continuous social reconstruction, these former indictments or dire prophesies seem to us, as we read them, baseless. Indeed, so they were in so far as they announced an approaching breakdown of the family as a social institution. These statements tell us that the plight of the modern family is unique only in its unprecedented intensity and also warn us that in thinking of the family of the past and present there is an extraordinary temptation greater

than in any other sphere of social interest to look backward for the Golden Age. Certainly the history of the American family from the earliest days of settlement to the present reveals periodic changes that in varying degree became to persons sensitive to what was happening indications of the weakening of the family.

Always the task of the family is to serve human need. This explains some of the difficulties of the family as it attempts to adjust itself to changing circumstances. Here again we are tempted, but to an exaggeration of present motivation rather than to an idealizing of the past. This attempt to serve human need has always furnished the fundamental support of the family as an institution, even though emphasis from time to time has moved from the extreme of chiefly stressing the institution to the opposite concentration on the individual human beings composing it. The twentieth century has already seen a sharp reversal of the former trend so optimistically acclaimed by some students of society a few years past.[26] This ebb and flow can safely be interpreted only as the working of the law of action and reaction. Always, however, the purpose that gives the institution its survival is human need brought forth in such massive, complex, and even inconsistent expression that any momentary interpretation is highly selective—itself, as time alone shows, a reflection of social changes. Subjective partisanship, the desire for persuasive comparisons, leads to the simplifying of social phenomena and thereby to their distortion. Any strong movement in one direction as a result of social change creates conditions that tend toward reversal. This effect of change has significance for the family just as it has for all other institutions.

It is customary to think of this changing of the family as an adaptation to social circumstances. This is true only if one widens the idea of environment so as to include all the influences, both past and present, that move upon family life. Fundamentally, the family in transition is seeking the same fitness in

[26] E. C. Lindeman, "Newer Currents of Thought on Parent Education," *New Republic*, vol. 51, p. 172.

relation to its environment that the biological organism struggles for in its effort to survive. The family, however, as it seeks adjustment is sensitive to traditions, to habit preferences coming from the past, to deliberate attempts to move the family in a certain direction or to prevent its stirring from well-established practices, carried on by preachment, propaganda, and agitation, and even to domestic habits and housekeeping routine, so that it is never free merely to respond to the immediate pressing needs with an intelligent, consciously designed program. When looked upon over long stretches it becomes clear that the family is forced to conform, at least in large measure, to existing environmental circumstances; but its adaptation is not necessarily logical or causal at any particular time, nor is it consistent or fully adequate over long periods.

The family, moreover, is never a helpless, subjected social institution, but rather, like the higher biologic organisms, it affects the environment as well as responding to it. It is in this reciprocity of relationship with environmental circumstances that we find the confusions, the tendencies toward instability and disorganization in the field of domestic relationship. Social influences originating in the family collide with environmental forces that have their origin elsewhere. This alternation of stimuli and response, discussed in Chapter XVIII, is so complex and diverse that although statistically trends of the movement may be established, a complete, perfectly balanced description of contemporary changing is something that the social science specialists seek rather than achieve.

Points of tension

At present, when the family is so clearly in transition, it is possible at least to detect the points of tension. The uniqueness of the individual family is in large measure due to the form, the force, and the duration of these clashing interests. They may be classified as personal individualism within the family, family interests conceived as a whole, and social welfare; that

is, group values as seen with a wider perspective than that provided by the family taken by itself. The meaning of this conflict of interests, often amounting to the clashing of discordant social forces, has to be found not by objective measurements but by the disturbances it brings to family unity and the consequences that come from it in the careers of each of the interacting members of the family. The collision can be generalized by summarizing the multitude of experiences of the individual family members, and then the extent of instability appears in the effect the conflict has upon the integrity of the family as a social institution.

II. *Socialized Motives of the Family*

THE MEANING OF MOTIVE. It is necessary, in order to discover how the family functions as a social institution, to trace the ways in which it takes over the fundamental desires expressed in human nature and makes an institutional use of them. These fundamental psychic drives are best thought of as motives. This basic type of propulsion, as it appears on the human level, has been variously defined. There has also been a variety of classifications both in psychology and in sociology. Likewise the tendency appears in the interpretations of many explorers of human conduct to select one motivation and make it the chief or exclusive source of the dynamics of human behavior.

The word "motive" carries the thought of the drive toward behavior as well as any other term. It is used to describe the transforming of organic, potential energy into psychic energy. What on the animal level is a biological drive controlled by instinct-utilizing organic energy is on the human plane, where consciousness operates, a higher and more complex drive for satisfaction, chiefly selective and inhibitive but also in slight measure creative.[1] These urges that issue in consciousness as desires flow out of the entire personality, although the energy that makes possible the accompanying body activities comes forth from the organism. This means that the emotions have a large place in the experience. The great part which the endocrines contribute to the motives that drive conduct must not lead to the interpretation that only the body sources of emotional

[1] William S. Sadler, *Theory and Practice of Psychiatry*, p. 55; Arthur P. Noyes, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry*, pp. 29-30.

experience are involved. Revolutionary as has been our recent insight into emotional life, from a better understanding of the operation of the endocrine glands of the body, it is nevertheless true that neither morality nor any other social system of values has yet been successfully reduced to chemistry,[2] and that morality attempts a supreme socialization of human motives. Intelligence as well as emotional pressure must be included in the idea of the human motive. There is a goal-seeking, a conscious quest of satisfaction, which reveals the mental endowment as well as the emotional dynamics of human behavior.

Society and motives

However motives are defined and classified, their goal is survival. Whatever specific form they take and however they are conceived in the consciousness of the person attempting to fulfill desires, their final cause is the effort to live possessed by all organisms. They contain the dynamic push toward adaptation which makes survival possible. On the human level, however, these activities deserve an interpretation in accord with the larger meaning of survival. Although physical living is fundamental and from its viewpoint man's adjustment is not unlike that of other animals, this interest does not exhaust the motivation. Consciousness has so widened the sort of survival man seeks that it does not seem under ordinary circumstances that much that he does has any semblance to the animal's seeking to live. Adaptation has taken on psychic and social aims, and much of the energy of the individual life goes into efforts to win these satisfactions that bring to the ego feelings of success. The original survival process has been refined and enlarged because it expresses itself through the medium of self-consciousness.

Society may be conceived of as an organization that furnishes advantages in the effort for survival. Animal societies carry on in the narrower meaning of this goal. Human societies assume

[2] R. G. Hoskins, *The Tides of Life*, p. 111.

a larger task. They represent an accumulation of experience transmitted by that passing on of culture which we call social heredity. Although society has to subordinate the individual, so that frequently he experiences sharp coercion, it greatly adds to his resources as he seeks individual survival in the larger sense. It is, therefore, not too much to say that the motives that arise in the personal consciousness are shaped by social organization and that society keeps its existence and gathers its vitality by its power to direct these individual purposes. The family is a specialized division of society which in its particular sphere also maintains the self by using human motivation which it turns toward the values that arise through the association of husband and wife and of parent and child.

This acting of the family upon human motives can best be seen if we search contemporary family life. We can seek out the large basic motives as they appear in domestic experience and consider what they bring the family and what the family does to influence their expression. From such a background we can turn to the more difficult task of finding the incentives that, encouraged by child-parent relationships, brought a widening of the infancy period and gave it a richer meaning. At least we can discover the human cravings that have taken advantage of a longer and more intimate companionship of parent and child as this broke away from the limitations enforced by instinct during the nurture period of animals.

The fundamental psychic drives

The first life-urge can be given such a wide interpretation as to seem dominant, thus making the others appear derivatives of the motivation we know as self-preservation. We can stretch it from the absolute necessity of hunger-satisfaction to the mere pleasure-seeking that seems so distant from the more primitive meaning of self-preservation. When, however, we include, as we must, the experiences that bring frustration or fulfillment to the ego, the effort to preserve the self breaks out in fear, in

anger, and in other emotional reactions, as well as in the basic quest for the means of physical survival.

This spread of the urge does not weaken the force nor lessen the meaning of the primitive underlying biologic drive to live. Self-preservation is, as Herbert Spencer said, the first law of life. This does not rule out human behavior that is far removed from an irresistible impetus to avoid death by any means whatsoever,[3] any more than it signifies that man cannot force himself to accept pain or that he is never free from action that is selfish in the popular usage of the term. Self-preservation is first in the sense that it provides the primary struggle of the organism. This primitive evidence of protoplasmic expressions of energy has been elaborated in the social life of man, where its crude urge to survive meets with restraint, suppression, and even antagonism from motivations that are composite products of psychic and social construction. The building, however, whatever its elevation, still rests on an organic foundation. Its purpose is survival. It is the task of the psychologist and the sociologist to uncover the processes, the environmental influences, that have led to the extension and refinement of the primitive urge to live so that it has come to include a yearning for psychic and social values, the absence of which may mean the individual's revolt against the existence that the organism tries to maintain.

Although this life-urge impels man toward social organization as a means of security and of multiplying satisfactions, it meets in the individual life from its first appearance in infancy a coercion from adults, administrators of the existing culture who attempt to discipline, to direct, and even to deny demands and desires that flow forth from the underlying motive of self-survival. Self-preservation is not the sole human drive, but it is so dynamic that it can never be left out of account, even though for the moment some other urge seems to be in command. It may not hold the center of consciousness, but rarely, if ever, is it pushed out of the background of the total person,

[3] Trigant Burrow, *The Social Basis of Consciousness*, pp. 127-128.

and at any moment, even upon occasions when it acts as an unadulterated animal instinct, it may take over the control of behavior. The pressure for self-preservation, expanded as it is by man's equipment of self-consciousness, carries its meaning far beyond the survival of the physical organism. This accretion of quality as well as of quantity opens up opportunity for the socialization of desires that because of their origin would seem self-confined. Thus the needs of self-maintenance are carried beyond the necessities of mere existence, and through the quest for pleasure find an immense field for expansion. To distinguish between the demands that are stark necessities for continuing life and those that are felt to be indispensable to make the life worth living, we classify the latter as self-gratification. The important thing to notice is that the individual with a consciousness that permits him to evaluate the conditions of his life may find the absence of satisfactions that from the viewpoint of survival alone are luxuries or vanities, to be so great a denial of his needs as to seem a starvation of the ego, even to the point of making physical survival undesirable.

Food may be chosen as an illustration of this spread from pressure for the satisfaction of needs to pressure for the satisfaction of luxury-cravings. No demand of the organism is more primitive or more compelling than this that comes from the necessity of nutriment. The amount of food that the organism at any time can consume is also limited. In spite of this the qualitative extension of food-cravings is immense and even in simple societies reveals a socialization that carries hunger not only out of the limitations of the individual but even of the domestic group. The feast is a striking example of this enlargement of a basic self-preservation motive.[4] Food-taking is lifted out of its elemental meaning and takes over a ritualistic and social feature that gives it serious group significance. Even though the feast is called to celebrate some event in the career of the individual, such as birth, marriage, or death, it is regarded

[4] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, pp. 300-329.

as a social occurrence and does, in fact, function as a means of strengthening the bonds of common interest. The satisfactions accompanying the consumption of food are far greater than those possible from eating in solitude.[5] When the feast is called as a means of carrying through some undertaking, the holiday atmosphere increases the spirit of co-operation and gives zest to the labor required.

Food-cravings have also been carried away from their original purpose by the refinements of taste and the acquisition of artificial appetites. There is a great difference between the preparation of food required for survival and cooking as it has developed as an art catering to human preferences. In addition to this we have the discovery of the narcotics and the intoxicants that are made use of for the gaining of pleasures that may even be detrimental to self-maintenance.

This annexing of cultivated desires is not restricted to cultures that have been able to create a surplus of food products and to lift the general standard of living far from the basic requirements for existence. Peoples whose food material includes rats, snakes, and lizards, repellent in appearance and smell, expend considerable energy in obtaining various ingredients for chewing and smoking that are without value as a means of nutriment.[6] As one would expect, these luxuries are featured at social gatherings and feasts and even in any act of hospitality. The natives are quick to take advantage of every opportunity to celebrate with intoxicants.[7] The greatest opportunity for the exploiting of the North American Indian has been that provided by his love of intoxicants. However detrimental these artificially created needs may seem from a survival point of view, they have acquired a large place in the socialization of the hunger aspects of self-preservation. In the case of condiments we see a development that has stimulated the appetite by changing the flavor of food material and removing the monotony of a repetitious diet.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 303.
[6] I. H. N. Evans, *Among Primitive Peoples in Borneo*, p. 116.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

In this expansion of the food aspects of self-preservation the family assumes an important and undoubtedly the chief role. The use of fire as a means of preparing food was one of the first discoveries that made possible a refinement denied the animals.[8] The home was built around the hearth. If we think of the primitive home as merely a camping place,[9] this establishment of a relatively permanent abode, encouraged as it must have been by the utilization of fire, put in the hands of the family, as the art of cooking developed, the strategic control of enlarging and enriching the diet.

The opportunity of the family was not limited to the possibilities furnished by cooking, for in addition the providing of food material was carried on by the family as an economic unit. Not only did the family further the withdrawal of the self-preserving, nutriment-providing activities from their original primitive function, but the home as an organization reacted to the food changes. It has been suggested, for example, that the long nursing period necessary for infant survival carried on by simple people who had no safe substitute for suckling prevented monogamy in the strictest sense, since it was customary for the mothers not to have intercourse during the nursing period, and it was unlikely that the husbands would accept so long a denial.[10]

We are on more certain ground when we recognize the effect of one of the first primitive tools, the grinding-stone, as a means of increasing available food material and also, by decreasing the labor of mastication, of releasing energy for other activities.[11] This invention contributed to the lessening of the time given by the mother to the nursing of her infant by providing other means of nourishment.[12] These assumptions regarding happenings at a time so distant as forever to be lost from our knowledge

[8] Herman Klaatsch, *The Evolution and Progress of Mankind*, p. 114.
[9] Julius Lippert, *The Evolution of Culture* (George Peter Murdock, tr.), p. 64.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

at least point out that all available evidence leads to the conviction that the family had first place in the dislodging of human food-seeking from its elementary survival level.

This is not the only activity related to self-preservation that reveals the effects of familial experience. Although it would be a partisan interpretation that would insist that play and recreation exclusively came out of the fundamental urge of self-maintenance, it is clear that this drive has contributed to the impulse to play, and that the struggle to survive has profited from play. It is equally clear that play makes its appearance in the life of the individual during the time when the family has its maximum influence, and that as a rule the parent responds with satisfaction to the efforts he sees the child putting forth. It is indeed true that the term "play" in this connection represents the conventional adult point of view. As a matter of fact the so-called play of the infant might better be described as his work.[13] The behavior of the infant contains in elemental form both of the traits that in later development lead us to distinguish work and play. In so far as the play element can be isolated, it becomes clear that the family has been as certainly a unit of play as a unit of production.

There is also the enormous territory of experience that we regard as pleasure-seeking that must be included among the derivatives of self-preservation. Survival, as it takes the form of struggle in the consciousness of modern men, ordinarily is a quest for satisfactions far above the brute effort to live. Merely to state this is to emphasize the significance of the family not only as a means of providing or denying demands for specific pleasures but also as the most powerful agency for building in the life of the growing child the desires that drive toward the satisfactions that seem necessary for self-fulfillment.

If we think of these various extensions of self-preservation as a sort of accretion gathered through long stages of culture, we may define the way in which the human offspring has become

[13] Arnold Gesell and Helen Thompson, *Infant Behavior, Its Genesis and Growth*, p. 35.

included in the parent's thought of self-preservation as an enlargement of the original instinct. The higher animals show, at least for a time, concentrated, intense attention to the nurture and protection of the young. Impressive as this is, this same relationship among human beings has both more meaning and a longer meaning. The addition of memory and imagination gives new significance to what in the survival process, even on the animal level, has supreme importance. Each parental reaction as it characteristically appears in the behavior of modern men and women permeates and reinforces all the acquisitions of the original impulse ranging from food-getting to pleasure-seeking.

When we consider the second great human urge, for sex and reproduction, it becomes apparent that these fundamental drives, although clearly distinguishable in the analysis of behavior, rarely act in isolation to control conduct, but rather become a source of energy which ordinarily combines with contributions from other life-urges to form a composite rather than a simple motivation. It is true that self-preservation and reproduction can collide and are frequently interpreted as antagonistic influences. This does not mean that they usually appear as such in human behavior or that the practices of human nature do not commonly result from an alliance of impulses that are derivatives of several rather than one fundamental life-motive. It is not that human nature responds first to one and then to another major occurrence of psychic desire but rather that, like a great river, it is made by its chief tributaries, each with its own watershed.

Self-preservation, and sex and reproduction, constitute the most important of these, and it is not strange that analysis is frequently content with distinguishing these two or that they are often put in contrast with one another. One of the consequences of this dualistic explanation of human behavior is the placing upon sex and reproduction of exclusive responsibility for the coming of marriage and the family. This monopoly of influence is insisted upon in spite of the fact that we have even now substantial family experience that does not recognize the

meaning of human reproduction and that does not confine sex within the family.[14]

Union of sex and reproduction

It is customary in literature on the subject to unite sex and reproduction as expressions of a common instinct, but it is more accurate to distinguish the motivations that lead to sex conduct from those that appear in relation to the coming of offspring. Even in the animal it is necessary to recognize a difference, and the distinction is far greater in human experience. Among animals we find a separation in the time during which the two interests function, as well as unlikeness of action. On the human level, as one would expect, this dissimilarity is far greater; indeed, there are men and women heavily endowed in impulses that lead to the one experience, who feel little or even no attraction toward the other. Even though both sets of activities, when looked at from the point of view of nature's purpose, belong together, the first aiming at conception and the second bringing forth the appropriate routine for the care of offspring, it is necessary for clear thinking to recognize the great separation that human evolution has made possible.

Sex as hunger

One of the most common descriptions of the sex urge is its definition as a hunger. This analogy is useful in bringing out the strength of impulses resulting primarily from conditions of the physical body. When considered from the point of view of its origin and its force, sex is very like the quest for food, but in spite of this, when looked at closely, it is apparent that they cannot be regarded as essentially identical. They have one great difference that has fundamental meaning for society. Although sex, even in animal experience, may draw power from an organic

[14] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Father in Primitive Psychology*.

instinct that is irresistible even to the point of forcing the individual to face the risk of death, it nevertheless is not a necessity for individual survival. The body, however, must have food to live. In contrast with this we have animals, especially in the domestic state, and humans who never attain satisfaction of physical sex but who nevertheless live, and apparently without handicap.[15]

One merely needs to ask himself what sort of social life would exist if sex were literally a hunger in the same sense that the need of food is a hunger. Not only are marriage and family life of the types known during the historic period inconceivable under such circumstances, but so also is the coming of anything more than the most fragmentary type of culture. Human energy would be constantly drawn into aggressions and contentions as individual males and females struggled in an association that could best be described as a condition of potential universal rape.

Sublimation of sex

Every social group of which we have knowledge has in some measure restrained and limited the sex desires of the individual. These limitations have frequently, as is true at present, left a minority devoid of sex satisfaction even as adults, but such barriers could never have been erected if the need of normal sex activity had been as imperative as the demand for food. This is no academic distinction, since the coercion of sex has made possible the extension of values that constitute civilization. Especially has this discipline contributed during adolescence to the maturing of both mind and body, even though sublimation at this period is and always has been a cause of individual tension.

The full importance of this sublimation of sex as a fountain of energy for social development does not appear until it is related to the growth of the brain and especially the effect of this

[15] Abraham Myerson, *Social Psychology*, p. 475.

upon the sex life. Hunger for food is not, of course, an isolated body experience to be assigned, for example, to the stomach or to the taste buds of the tongue. Nevertheless these parts of the human body have a larger place in the causes of the feeling of hunger and our attitude toward food than do other parts. In the case of sex there is an even greater specialization, and the brain has been given the commanding influence over the complicated physiological and nervous mechanism which results in bringing into consciousness the realization of sex hunger.

This interrelation of the brain and the physiological equipment for reproduction has permitted the development of the sex urge to a point where it has moved the desire as it appears in the life of men and women far from that characteristic of the lower animals. There are at least grounds for holding to a still more significant association, correlating individual differences in sex vigor with nervous and mental endowment.[16] This, it has to be granted, is not always true, for in so complex an experience exceptions to the rule may easily be made by particular ethical, nervous, or glandular influences. Recognizing this and taking into account the perversions that clearly need to be considered as abnormalities rather than as examples of extraordinary sex vitality, it is reasonable to assume that the superior brain has opportunity not only to contribute both to the quantity and quality of the sex urge but also to draw energy from it when it is turned away from direct sex expression into the other activities which we know as sublimations. The very definite correlation which has appeared in certain historic characters, such as Napoleon Bonaparte,[17] suggests that there must be in persons highly endowed nervously, and strong willed in regard to inhibitions, an enormous overflow of energy that, blocked from direct expression, furnishes the vitality behind the great quantity of intellectual or social activity. The neurotic, who, according to all schools, reveals difficulties in his sex life, portrays the failure of sublimation that undoubtedly is carried through by a

[16] Knight Dunlap, *Civilized Life*, p. 87.
[17] Boris Sokoloff, *Napoleon: A Doctor's Biography*.

stronger type of character who has not less sex impulse than those in trouble but more ability to control and utilize his dynamic impulse.

Since the sublimation of sex in some degree is apparent in every society of which we have knowledge, preparation for and training in this discipline become an important task placed upon the family. If the modern American home has overdone this conditioning, especially in the case of the woman, and has helped to maintain a taboo which has made intelligent control of the sex impulse in the modern world difficult, these consequences, however much we deplore them as obstacles to wholesome living, do show that the disposition toward sex is very largely a family product. Psychoanalytic literature stresses the fact that there is a great deal more influence exerted by the family in the period during which the sex attitude is taking form than appears in ordinary conscious self-realization. We have no reason to think that the neurotic alone, that is, the individual who for some reason needs to seek outside help for his troubles, carries unwittingly, as a result of family influence, conduct-influencing, unconscious motivation rooted in early sex experience. The failures chargeable to family teaching, the overcompensation of morbid fears of sex, demonstrate the power of the family, which in the majority of cases, looked at from the point of view of time and place, functions to bring about a workable social adjustment at a point where individual desire and social welfare easily become antagonistic.

The task put upon the family is unescapable. Sex desire as a primitive impulse too easily leads to unsocial or antisocial practices ever to be left free from an education that seeks to repress and idealize sex hunger.[18] Sex, left to itself, not only would tempt individuals toward a selfish license but also would generate attitudes that would undermine the common good, but this is covered up by the relatively successful manner in which Western civilization has consolidated sex with love. They are

[18] Geoffrey May, *Social Control of Sex Expression.*

not organic fellows even though literature and poetry regard them as such. They have been successfully yoked together in the majority of personal careers by an educational process similar to that which has been carried on for centuries and chiefly through family contact. Sex lacks the tenderness and affection that are the very essence of love.[19] Even if we hesitate to go as far as Stekel and assert that there is no cruelty which is not toned with sexual pleasure,[20] we must recognize the overwhelming evidence that primitive sex impulse is self-centered and lacking in tenderness.[21]

It is true that the impulse carries the individual outside himself, but as an unadulterated primitive urge, with only exploiting purposes, which is of the same order as food-seeking for the purposes of nutrition. The sex partner is sought as an environmental utility, and it is just this that neither the family nor society for its security and enrichment can abide. The social group for its own safety must constrain all human motivation, but no impulse is worked upon as is that of sex. The great achievement has been the tying of this with reproduction so that the sentiments of the latter color the former, a fusion that has been so well accomplished in a great multitude of cases that conventional thinking assumes identity between human urges that are fundamentally different and, as individual careers disclose, easily separated.

This accomplishment of an extraordinary consolidation, forced by local manipulation, has chiefly been the responsibility of the family because of its key position in the shaping of young life. The domestic institution has been charged with the task of uniting the two impulses and maintaining their alliance in the practices of the individual. Such a task has not been carried through without tension, especially when the supreme consolidation has been sought in monogamic affection.

[19] Robert Briffault, *The Mothers,* vol. 1, p. 121; Myerson, *op. cit.,* pp. 518-523; Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex,* vol. 3, pp. 69 sqq.

[20] Wilhelm Stekel, *Sadism and Masochism,* vol. 1, p. 31.

[21] Briffault, *op. cit.,* p. 119.

No one has expressed this more forcefully than Lester Ward, who, recognizing the trend toward a more and more monogamic domestic code, realized that this involved for many an enormous strain, leading him to the statement that to some monogamy is still intolerable, to others barely endurable, to still others generally satisfactory as the best condition obtainable, while to a considerable number it is an ideal condition whose improvement cannot even be conceived.[22]

In accord with a familiar tendency in social experience, the interpretation of which we owe to Sumner, both society and the family have made liberal use of taboo as a means of controlling the sex desire of the individual. Effective as this has been as a program of repression and coercion, it has not been intelligent and adaptive to social circumstances in the way that effective sex education demands in the modern world. As a consequence, even though the family accomplishes the discipline of the impulse that society expects it to carry through, it increasingly, by following the taboo program, hurts individuals, makes sexual relationships difficult and unwholesome, and stimulates in many a rebellion by which they escape the barriers placed upon them by domestic influence but at the cost of self-integrity and other values greater than those furnished by mere sex satisfaction.

The taboos of sex as a rule act more repressively toward women than toward men. It is common to find a difference in the regulations affecting boys and girls showing itself at the time of puberty. Taboo is used to enforce the social conventions. Especially where virginity becomes an ideal, the social routine is influenced by the need of guarding the girl. The taboos are not thought of as repressive, because they are not mere negations. They register social approval and social prestige and, like the initiation ceremonies, are either taken as a matter of course or welcomed because of the distinction they bring.[23] Woman's inferiority, particularly when it is associated

[22] Lester F. Ward, *Pure Sociology*, pp. 410-411.
[23] Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament*, p. 89.

with the idea that she represents the property rights of the man, tends toward discrimination against women.[24] The biological functions of the woman as child-bearer also encourage taboos, and, it must be confessed, sometimes to her advantage. Especially are these taboos connected with her experiences in pregnancy, childbirth, and menstruation.[25] Among the early Hebrews we find a protective taboo against the menstruating woman.[26] Likewise we find regulations concerning the postpartum period, declaring that the woman who has been pregnant is unclean—in the case of delivery of a male child for seven days, the same length of time assigned to the menstruating woman, and then, the son being circumcised, for thirty-three more days.[27] If a female child is born the period is doubled and the mother is not permitted to take part in holy and ritualistic functions until fourteen and then sixty-six additional days have passed.[28]

The institution of marriage

Marriage, whatever form it takes and however we conceive of its origin, clearly represents socialization of the sex impulse. This does not mean that we can insist that marriage came into being merely as a social recognizing and licensing of sex relations. On the contrary, we discover that marriage is well established and effective as a means of control even when it has nothing to offer as an opportunity for satisfaction of the sex impulse. For example, we find Malinowski reporting that the Trobrianders are eager to marry even when they already possess each other sexually and it might seem that they had no motive for union. As he rightly affirms, in such circumstances failure to see motivation comes from not discovering the complex and subtle interests associated with marriage.[29] Even

[24] W. G. Sumner and A. G. Keller, *The Science of Society*, vol. 3, p. 1750.
[25] John Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 48-49.
[26] Lev. 18.19 and 20:18.
[27] *Ibid.*, 12:2.
[28] Charles J. Brim, *Medicine and the Bible*, p. 192.
[29] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. 1, p. 80.

though society be indifferent to a mere occurrence of sexual relations among the adults, there is still a strong pressure to lead the young people toward marriage, without which they cannot achieve status. It is interesting to notice, however, that the author informs us that to look upon marriage simply as a product of coercive pressure would mean failure to see how naturally young people move toward a permanent mating.

Marriage, even in so simple a society, reveals the two sources of influences that have led to the institution. Society wants marriage and so does human nature. The more the sex urge takes on cultural and psychic significance, the stronger the trend to take marriage away from the mere licensing and approving of marital intimacy. Thus marriage comes as an evolutionary need even though the individual, as often appears in contemporary life, sees it as a limitation or social restriction of a primitive urge that seeks greater freedom. Marriage represents not only an insistence by society on some degree of discipline of physical sex hunger but also the securing of a basic socializing co-operation of males and females, products of nature's most significant and best guarded division of human nature.

It is impossible on the human plane to maintain a domestic fellowship upon an exclusive sex basis. Sex, unless it can expand and add other ties than mere passion-satisfaction, exhausts itself and in time loses its original strength. This explains the short-livedness of liaisons as well as the fading away of the support upon which many marriages are built. Primitive society added other mutuality than sex to bind those who married. Modern life does the same, or soon the substance of any marriage relationship begins gradually to disappear. Society does not so much use marriage to inhibit or discipline sex as it attempts, through the relationship, to bring forth incentives that can carry the impulse beyond itself. Sex per se, however compelling a force to draw men and women together, lacks staying power and cannot without reinforcement provide an enduring fellowship.

Reproduction and marriage

Marriage is indeed an important part of the maintenance superstructure of society.[30] It operates also as a motivation to lead the individual to seek the sex relationship that society favors. Allowing for individual variations and emphasis, it must nevertheless be recognized in any analysis of the social function of marriage that it is doubly rooted; this fact more than any other reveals how thoroughly human society has taken control of the sex desire that was once a primitive, self-satisfying urge, and has redirected it.

Nothing is clearer in the instinctive life of animals than the distinction between the sex and the reproductive mechanisms. One leads to mating and the other to the care of offspring. In the behavior of many of the higher animals, especially in that of birds, we see the two drives coming together and permitting a relationship that we do not exaggerate when we think of it as a type of marriage. In human behavior this correlation is so common as to appear the normal thing. Any attempt to standardize it, to insist that it is characteristic of human nature, is undoubtedly an overstatement, for it is clear that some individuals have chiefly the sex drive and that some are well endowed only for reproduction, while more frequently the two motivations conflict, and in still more cases one is strong when compared with the other. Marriage, however, in part functions as a social effort to encourage the union of the two great drives and to keep them in a continuous alliance. Even the animals that approach human experience are influenced by the time element in both sex and reproduction, so that separation occurs as a rule between the individual male and female as soon as the offspring no longer needs nurture. It is just this that human marriage attempts, and for the most part with success, to prevent. Marriage thus becomes from one viewpoint the gateway into the home, where reproduction has greater meaning than the sex drive.

[30] Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, pp. 2041-2043.

Whatever interpretation the mechanism of reproduction on the human level receives, and whatever meaning we charge to its instinctive origin, it is clear that the parental attitude toward the child and the child's reaction must be regarded as an emotional complex, not as a simple urge toward a mechanical routine. Although social suggestion certainly has a part in the development of the complex, it has acted to invigorate the impulses arising in mother-offspring contact even among animals rather than to graft on something alien. The enlargement which we now consider the normal feelings of parents is the product over a long period of time of attitudes and responses wakened by the association of parent and child. Thus parenthood has come to mean a depository of values highly regarded by the group and supported by all the props, ranging from outlawry to prestige, which society makes use of to secure its interests.

It is important to notice that we cannot regard either self-preservation or sex and reproduction, or any other of the motivations we select as primary, separate lines of behavior, as if human conduct were the result of energy that could be switched like electricity from one wire to another leading directly to its appropriate, characteristic conduct. Always, no matter what is emphasized, the whole organism is at work, and no drive is so exclusive as to make behavior simply a product of sex, parenthood, power-craving, or any of the other fundamental motives. Personality is always an expression of the organism acting as a whole.[31]

No matter how certainly consciousness seems to be possessed by one driving force that concentrates the attention, it is fallacious to suppose that because of this appearance the organism has only one activity and that it is in the command of a single motivation. The mere awareness of the desire associated with the flowing into consciousness of strong emotion does not mean that the personality is possessed by a single urge. Any

[31] Trigant Burrow, *The Biology of Human Conflict*, p. 55.

thoroughgoing searching soon lays bare a more complex situation to which other motivations contribute. We can separate, for example, self-preservation and sex and distinguish between sex and reproduction, but when the individual personality acts, the momentum comes from a coalition rather than from independent drives acting in a series. Especially is this true in the highly emotional experiences of marriage and parenthood. Therefore, neither can satisfactorily be interpreted as a product from a single fundamental motivation.

A common element, co-operation

The consolidation of sex and reproduction as it appears in the average domestic experience in conventional society has been furthered by the fact that they have possessed one element in common. Sex experience that has gathered any measure of psychic enrichment has demanded, at least for those who have not fallen within the group of the abnormal, a response from the partner that has made the relationship in some degree a co-operation. This normally has been true also in the experience of parenthood. Again leaving out individuals who at this point are abnormal, there has been the impulse on the part of father and mother to work together for the welfare of the child, and their feeling toward their offspring has encouraged an emotional partnership.

Among the animals nearest to man we find this same co-operation. The human development has extended it and taken away its periodic character so that it has led to a continuous fellowship in which each parent has meant more to the other because both have been possessed by interests centering upon the child. Thus both sex and reproduction have tended to drive the individual away from self-sufficiency and toward a recognition of the need of the other, and a valuing of the contribution from the other, without which both sex and parenthood have come to seem incomplete. The more developed this appreciation of the other, the more sensitive the individual to the ac-

cretions that the evolution of culture has given, the more reaction there is toward any lack of response on the part of the other. Thus an impersonal sex relationship, however satisfying as a mere physical experience, seems empty and disappointing even to the point of irritation. The parental relationship, likewise, even though it brings economic security through the father or adequate physical care from the mother, soon becomes repellent emotionally to the other parent committed to the child if there be unwillingness to share regard for the child. One maintaining or trying to maintain satisfactory parenthood covets from the mate a pooling of emotional interests, a partnership in family loyalties.

This common element in the sex and reproductive urges has significance not only because it brings the possibility of the family and the welding together of drives that otherwise might remain separate and, as we know from cases in which domestic maturity has not been achieved, become antagonistic to one another, but also because it permits a vigorous promotion of still further socialization. The building of social ties within the domestic sphere encourages social feelings outside. This prevents our ascribing society merely to the gregarious or herd instinct. It is possible, as human behavior sometimes illustrates, to have need of others, even to feel drawn to others gregariously, without giving to them or taking from them the slightest emotional fellowship. The self-centered person does not necessarily choose isolation.

It is in their denial of a particular type of comradeship that the unmarried experience their chief hardship and trial. It is not mere unsatisfied sex hunger, when this becomes a consequence of being single, it is not the absence of home comforts or the not having children that brings the costly penalty of remaining unmarried. It is rather that a line of social experience is blocked off and the individual does not enter in any degree personally into the struggle to achieve with another the man-woman form of spiritual unity. This growing together of husband and wife is the most common of the various

alliances that lift human nature above egotism, and the only one that average people are likely to achieve in a voluntary union. Parenthood provides commitment of another order, for it is a relationship that is nature-enforced, a complex of feeling never far from its earlier instinct-determination.

The unmarried are not only shut out; they feel shut out. Their taking over of some of the standard prerogatives of matrimony fails to bring them in. Sex-sharing carries them beyond egoistic barriers to be sure, but only in a temporary, even hate-recoiling way compared with marriage. The mere living together also becomes a partial substitute for marriage, since it is conditioned fellowship, an excursion rather than a settlement. It is here that any trial marriage meets its hazards.

This welding of man and woman by intermixture of motives is socially significant. Society is a by-product of many different interrelationships that help men and women escape the anarchy and limits of an egoistic self-consciousness. Domestic intimacy is thus a creative socializing process that has meaning beyond the union-making experience of the individuals. The addition of children carries the man-wife union to still greater social significance.

The origin of what we call society, as it has come into being in the evolution of the human organism, is a product of the total personality. Powerful as has been the gregarious instinct in bringing and holding people together, it alone has not created social life. Whether the state has grown out of the family or has developed along with the family, it matters not. Domestic experience has in either case made its contribution. This has been made possible in no small measure by the naturalness of co-operation. Both the sex and reproduction incitements, when heavily endowed—as in the case of lovers seeking their sex partners while possessed by the ideals of a sensitive imagination, and of parents drawn together by a common regard for their helpless child—have pushed human nature away from a self-sufficient individualism and have drawn it to a wider sharing of interests with others. As the family has succored the

child, it also has allied itself with the forces making and maintaining society.

The power motivation

It proves helpful in the analysis of human behavior to recognize the power urge as a third fundamental impulse even though it is easy to contend that this is a specialized expression of the first motivation. In any case, the attention often becomes fixed upon desires that originate in the individual's need of egoistic gratification. Here we find cravings of social significance showing themselves in struggle for authority, for prestige, or for relief from feelings of inferiority. On the negative side, when there is seeming infringement of the rights of the personality, loss of face, or defeat before the aggression of others, we have the emotions of anger, of hate, and of jealousy. The quest that comes from the effort to satisfy vanity offers an endless seeking in which temporary accomplishment becomes in turn a stimulant to still greater effort.

Modern life with its complications, its quicker passage up and down in social status, especially where civilization attempts to be democratic, makes the motivation of power not only a major momentum constantly goading the sensitive and the ambitious individual to activity, even to excessive activity, but also leads to frequent estimation of social position so that any advance carries with it the shadow of a possible future fall downward in social esteem. These reactions make clear how far the struggle to exist has been carried onto the levels where physical survival is taken for granted and the energy is consciously directed toward social survival. Thus the problems of the craving of power are by-products of man's success in lifting the meaning of his existence so that merely having food, shelter, physical security, and the satisfaction of sex passion no longer suffices. The individual wants distinction, applause, social security, or the feeling that he is exercising authority over others or making a contribution that is of worth to his fellows. The

power urge can range from the lowest forms of self-elevation to the highest expressions of a magnificent service for the welfare of others.

Obviously, the higher the standard of living and the greater the leisure, the more the stress upon the significance of the individual life. The more social stimulation the child receives to advance himself, especially from the home and the school, the greater opportunity the power urge has to influence conduct and emotion. Since the power motivation is so easily turned to unsocial expression, even antisocial exaggeration, society, although it stirs up in hundreds of ways hunger for egoistic gratification, also seeks to find ways to hold in check or to turn into wholesome channels this craving for prestige and power. The influences that flow into the life of the child are as inconsistent as is society itself. Some children are oblivious to the stimulation, some discipline it and make it a source of wholesome character, while others become enslaved to insatiable cravings.

The home and the power urge

The family has a strategic place in this decision as to what kind of power-craving will become characteristic of the individual life. The home as a social organization feels the pressures that lead toward social distinction and encounters the same temptations and insecurities that are met by the individual. It also becomes the motive of a great deal of power-striving. Eagerness to acquire property, to establish a reputation, to attain to offices of prestige, is not necessarily egoistic in the sense that it is sought by the individual for himself, for it may be familial in purpose.

The child is frequently chosen as a medium for the exploiting of family ambitions. This temptation comes not only to those parents who are naturally egoistically inclined but also to those who are suffering from emotional isolation, from a sense of personal failure, or from reactions to the loss of the love of

the spouse, to his or her death, or to divorce. A great part of the common wish of American parents that their children have better opportunities than they had is born of the power motive disguised and conventionalized. The atmosphere of the home produced by the interactions of husband and wife in their life together is perhaps the most potent of all influences in its effect upon the development of love of power in the child. This enters the life of the growing personality so early and so constantly that it quickly becomes so well established as to seem innate rather than acquired. Another cause that intensifies the power urge in the child is the attention he receives from his parents. It is more difficult to prevent mishap here when there is only one child in the family than when there are many. Neither the number nor the placing of the children in their age differences is by itself determining, for the power disposition of the child comes from more subtle circumstances than such facts as that there is only one child or that there are great differences in the ages of the children or that one is sickly as compared with the others or represents a different sex from that of the others. These conditions may encourage a tendency toward overdeveloping the child's craving for power, but the wise parent will always find ways of escape.

The social urge

A fourth major motivation that can be distinguished as it appears in human nature is the social urge. Like the others, this may be isolated in abstract thinking, but in human experience it is not only composite but allied to the other major motives. In the lower animals the most elementary expression of this urge is found in gregariousness, the attraction that draws individual animals together. This has been well described by Trotter as the herd instinct.[32] The value to the individual animal of an impulse that leads him to keep with others is obvious. It provides the basis for much of the group solidarity among animals that

[32] W. Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War.*

has been so impressively interpreted by Kropotkin.[33] Although there are exceptions, as for example among the carnivora, the general trend in the struggle for survival is unmistakable. The unsocial creature has been at a disadvantage.[34]

This tendency of animals only lightly endowed with nervous structure to cling together has been properly called *social cohesion.*[35] The advantage of this clinging together has been traced even in the history of the microorganisms, where we find the bacterial colony forming itself with a sort of elemental urge, providing the conditions necessary for close group integration.[36] Thus the incipient social stages apparent in the bacteria have had a survival value, and it is out of this utility, illustrated by the practices of our lowest forms of life, that our social habits have developed.[37]

The extension of the social urge through the human development has been immense. It has taken expressions that are far removed from mere gregariousness. This is not surprising when we consider how distinctive sympathy is as a human quality. Even among animals strongly gregarious we find absence of tenderness or inclinations of fellow feeling. Indeed, the animal basis for these qualities is clearly to be found more in motherhood reactions than in the herd instinct.[38] Among humans the origin of the social impulse cannot be limited to the desire merely to be with others. The social urge moreover extends beyond any prudential choice of comradeship with others for purposes of security. The advantages of such an association are nevertheless clear, and if we can conceive of the individual man ever living in isolation, we are forced to think of his life, as did Hobbes, as one of continual fear because of constant danger of violent death, an existence solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.[39]

[33] P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, chaps. 1 and 2.
[34] Franklin Henry Giddings, *The Principles of Sociology*, p. 204.
[35] William Patten, *The Grand Strategy of Evolution*, p. 364.
[36] W. C. Allee, *Animal Aggregations.*
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 262.
[38] Myerson, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
[39] E. Hershey Sneath, *The Ethics of Hobbes*, p. 143.

Desire for social standing

The presence of self-consciousness has greatly enlarged the social urge and made it include, in addition to what it represents among animals, the desire for social standing. Thus it becomes a motive for a distinction that wins the approval of the group. As such it is one of the powerful motives clearly operating from the earliest period of childhood. Some of its expression we catalogue as vanity, and although almost every individual meets with influences operating to restrain this motivation, it persists and its disappearance would disintegrate our social culture. A much more group-encouraged form of the social urge as it ties up with personal gratification is ambition. This, as it affects human conduct, enormously contributes to the enrichment of culture and the lifting of the standard of living.[40]

The highest form of social motivation, and the rarest, is social sympathy. It may or may not exist in alliance with strong gregariousness. It is the expression of an extraordinary socialized imagination that, accompanied with an intense spiritual fellowship, carries the individual out of his life into that of others and awakens in him a strong desire to increase the welfare of others. This drive may be ineffective because of lack of understanding, of good judgment, or of practicality, or because of numerous other deficiencies, but it flows with strength on the highest level of feeling. It is clearly not a mere enlarging of gregariousness but is instead a highly developed composite product of human experience. It is childhood-rooted and therefore chiefly a family product. No human career illustrates its strength and its origin better than does that of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. An unhappy childhood, in which parental neglect was partly compensated for by a kindly nurse, so sharpened the sympathies of Shaftesbury that in spite of his lack of sociability and broadmindedness he became as great a

[40] Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 2114.

philanthropist as the world has known.[41] The career of Dorothea Dix, America's most effective philanthropist, parallels remarkably that of Shaftesbury.[42]

The religious urge

The last major motivation is not exactly described by calling it the religious impulse, but no other term brings out so well its characteristics. It has been interpreted as the extension on the human level of an instinct of curiosity associated with the emotion of wonder. The experience of simple people brings evidence that this motivation is in large degree the searching for security. Because of this fact fear has been stressed by some interpreters as the chief source of this fifth human motivation. Major Arthur G. Leonard has given us one of the most impressive portrayals that we have of a primitive dualistic religious system. In this it is easy to see religion bringing security and confidence in an environment laden with suspicion and fear. The author describes the motivation of the natives as follows:

> Suspicion and fear, then, were the primary instincts, the active and motive sensations that stirred man first to thought, and then to action, but they were not the only two. Two other causes were at work at the same time, which, although opposing causes, combined to produce the effect which, of all effects in the history of mankind, has in its operations approached nearer to the laws of Nature than any other, merely because of its natural origin.
>
> Just as every poison has its antidote, if we only knew where to find it, so human instincts and energies are equally balanced; hence it was that the higher instincts of confidence and veneration, which were also in man, but lying fallow, counteracted the antipathetic effects of forces that, had they been left in undisputed possession of the arena, would have terminated not merely in disaster, but possibly in the utter extinction of humanity. For it seems to me quite reasonable to infer that it is to this dualism, or conflicting

[41] J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *Lord Shaftesbury*.
[42] Helen E. Marshall, *Dorothea Dix*.

principle of natural unity, that nature, certainly humanity, owes her very existence.[43]

We are indebted to Durkheim for our most positive sociological definition of the purpose of religion, one that insists that whatever its form, the religious system fulfills a human need, and in such a way as to be of communal benefit.[44] It is in this social utility that he distinguishes magic, which has an individualistic function, from religion, which conserves the group.[45]

Religion takes such varied forms that it is to be expected that there will always be controversy as to its origin as a major source of human behavior.[46] There is much greater unanimity as to the present function of religion on the modern social level. In it we find the attainment of cosmic security, motivation for benevolent service, authority for practices and beliefs, means of bringing an end to personal conflict, and the providing of compensations in careers that seem relatively empty. These objectives are differently emphasized in individual experiences; they are sometimes found clustering together, and in other cases one so predominates over the others as to seem the exclusive source of the religious feeling.

Whatever form religious experience takes, it is seldom difficult to detect the influence of childhood as causally first not only in time but in long-continued effects. This, under normal circumstances, gives to the family the largest opportunity to direct spiritual motivation. In simple society, where fear overshadows much of the practices, the need of safeguarding the group by inculcating obedience through religious tradition is felt so strongly and so constantly as to make the family the most effective educational agency.

[43] *The Lower Niger and Its Tribes*, pp. 87-88.

[44] Émile Durkheim, *Elementary Forms of Religious Life.*

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 45-47.

[46] As illustrations of various points of view see: E. Washburn Hopkins, *Origin and Evolution of Religion;* H. Höffding, *The Philosophy of Religion;* G. W. Cooke, *The Social Evolution of Religion;* H. Nelson and Regina Wieman, *Normative Psychology of Religion;* Everett Dean Martin, *The Mystery of Religion;* Alfred N. Whitehead, *Religion in the Making.*

Religion and the home

In modern life the tie between religious faith and idealism is so usual that the ethical and social training of children in homes where there is any degree of religious conviction is sure to be based on the teaching of the church. Even in families where orthodox religious sentiment has been smothered or repudiated as the result of materialistic or modernistic philosophies of life, the fundamental cosmic attitude, the nearest approach in such cases to the religious life, for the most part originates in the family atmosphere and reveals parental teaching consciously or unconsciously conveyed. The influence of the home may, on the other hand, become a vain attempt to anchor the child's developing life to a stationary, traditional ideal, with the consequence that the religious training becomes eventually a source of conflict;[47] but even this division of inner life, however painful to the individual, bears testimony to the persistency and the strength of the spiritual motive of life. It also again reveals the supremacy of the family in shaping religious feeling.

[47] C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, p. 276.

III. *The Survival Functions of the Family*

SURVIVAL ORGANIZATION. The human body is intricate almost past finding out, but its essential purpose, like that of all other organisms, is survival. So long as it maintains its integrity, it functions to maintain its life through processes that enable it to keep its favorable contact with its environment, utilizing available resources for self-maintenance, while carrying on within itself an elaborate, continuous flow of activities. This vast complexity yields under analysis, as is generally recognized, two fundamental but distinguishable survival motives—the maintenance of life, and the transmission of life. The first is temporary, since its effort to protect from death cannot be more than postponement. The second type of survival extends, if it has successful expression, beyond the person himself and perpetuates the race. The organism as a functioning intricacy operates to further these survivals which, although distinct in meaning, are not, as physiological processes, independent and self-contained.

The meaning of the human organism changes according to which of the two survival programs is traced through the life-history of the individual. The end purpose governs the selection of one complex of activities as compared with the other. Thus in one case preservation of the integrity of the body becomes the principle of selection, whereas in the other it is the maintenance of the life-stream, leading to a different version. Yet ever the body performs as an integration, and the two sets of purposes are not only intertwined but so thoroughly related as activities of the organism that our selection of one rather than the other is an arbitrary choice governed by the specific purpose we seek to recognize.

Social evolution and survival

The struggle for survival cannot be conceived as merely the efforts of the individual organism to maintain its integrity in an ever present struggle to adapt to the environment and to compete with other forms of life also seeking food, reproduction, and security. There is also a socialization brought about by the need of survival. This development, commonly termed social evolution, is neither a replacement of nor an addition to the organic program for survival, but a different form of behavior through which the individuals by communal interdependence or co-operation increase favorable conditions for growth and security.[1]

Even Darwin, who during the last half of the nineteenth century was used as authority for a narrower conception of the struggle for life, recognized the necessity of including in the means of existence co-operation as well as competition of individuals.[2] Biological investigation has now corrected the partisan emphasis that Darwin's followers forced into the doctrine of evolution during the controversial period that followed publication of the *Origin of the Species*, and this principle of interrelation, which in its highest forms becomes co-operation, is now recognized to have been active from the beginning of life and to have been a fundamental trait favoring survival.[3]

Kropotkin, stimulated by the narrower conception of evolution widely held in his time, expressed protest by bringing out his *Mutual Aid*. In our time the significance of interdependence, of co-operation, has become axiomatic in any interpretation of the survival program. The supreme development of the principle has been found in the life of insects.[4]

[1] W. J. McGee, "The Beginning of Agriculture," *American Anthropologist*, 8:362-375.

[2] Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, second edition, p. 163.

[3] W. C. Allee, *Animal Aggregations*, p. 355.

[4] P. Deegener, *Lebensgewohnheiten der Insekten*, Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer; Friedrich Alverdes, *Social Life in the Animal World;* W. M. Wheeler, *Social Life among Insects.*

The larger meaning of survival

Social evolution, taking advantage of the resources provided by human intelligence, carries on in part as a reinforcement of the same sort of processes that operate on the organic level, but in addition it opens up new territory, thus adding to the significance of survival. Man, through his growth of brain and endocrines, accumulates a superior endowment and surplus of energy which are used not only to better his body life but also to enrich psychic and social experience. This extension of the meaning of survival brings its burdens, since the new achievements intelligence makes possible, instead of serving the biological organism, easily may become a burden to it. The major trend, however, as we see it over long stretches of time, has been to favor physical survival and to carry the average life-expectancy forward.

At present the advantages of very recent advances in hygiene, diet, and medicine are most apparent in safeguarding the survival of the infant, while the burden put upon the organism by the growth and intensifying of culture shows itself most discouragingly in the middle-age period, so far as the death rate measures the efficacy of the survival processes.

The wants of the individual keep pace with his greater opportunity, leading the person to conceive of survival as including the attainment of values, the winning of satisfactions and not merely the getting of the bare necessities without which he cannot live. Indeed, except under extraordinary circumstances, he seldom becomes conscious of the functioning that is going on within the body to make his continued existence possible. Pain, starvation, and illness may at any time change this and make him aware of his survival processes and force him to think in more primitive terms of his struggle for self-maintenance.

The spread made possible by social evolution opens up new opportunity for the family. This institution, so thoroughly grounded in the fundamental impulses that appear in parent-

child relationships, as has already been discussed, is enlisted in the cultural approach to survival. It acts as a major social organization, a means of using the resources gathered through emotional and nervous surplus in furthering both physical survival in its narrowest sense and personal survival in its widest meaning.

The family and biological survival

The unique responsibility of the family as a means of reproduction and the rearing of children, as has been suggested,[5] hides the large part the family takes as an organization for self-maintenance. For a full appraisal of the role of the family in cultural history, it is necessary not only to distinguish between its reproductive functions and its economic services, but also to separate in the latter what it does for social security from its contribution to biological well-being. Parents do not protect children merely by bringing them food and shelter, indispensable as these are. Mothers do not limit themselves to the bringing of children into the world, or to feeding or dressing them or caring for them in the spirit of an adult servant.

In addition to all these indispensable activities, the family provides fulfillment for emotional, psychic, and social needs that in turn minister to the growth and health of the child and the biological integrity of the adult. Human evolution, operating over a long period, has made of the family organization a natural, co-operating fellowship, and along with this development has gone the awakening, through cultural stimulations, of needs in both the child and the adult that constitute an asset or a liability to body welfare according to the satisfaction or absence of satisfaction that these needs gain through familial contact. The significance of this family service in the child's life appears even in early infancy.

This explains the superiority of the foster home over the orphanage as a means of aiding physical survival and growth

[5] W. G. Sumner and A. G. Keller, *The Science of Society*, vol. 3, p. 2048.

in the case of parentless children, however efficiently and scientifically the institution may be maintained. Experience has led to the conviction widely and rightly felt that the happy home, for adults as well as for children, is a therapeutic organization that helps to lessen the hazards of environmental stress. The advantages of marriage and the family would be more clearly recognized if it were not for the complication and the danger of childbearing for the mother during her fertile period, and the incentives to worry that our present competitive economic and social conditions bring to the parent who is forced to carry his protective services into the future as he attempts to anticipate the later out-of-the-family career of the child.

The fact that the family itself creates or reflects strain, and even at times fully matured conflicts, must not conceal the greater fact that it furnishes both the child and the parent with satisfactions that have become culturally indispensable in the normal human career. From this viewpoint the family becomes a part of the favorable environment that the organism seeks for its growth or its adult functioning. Familial experience, it is true, can easily be turned so that it becomes a source of adverse influences, but this is true of even so indispensable and primitive a resource of the body as food. The greater complexity of familial experience renders it more liable to expressions that are fundamentally hostile rather than helpful to the ongoing of biological life. The general trend, however, is otherwise, and must have prevailed in the earliest period of human evolution as man slowly evolved away from his less well-equipped animal predecessors.

Undoubtedly the processes associated with the care of offspring, a product of biological inheritance, encouraged an expansion, and these accretions so favored the survival of the family member that without them the individual was left in a precarious position in the competitive struggle to live. There was no clear distinction, it would seem, at the time when human life was getting safely established, between family con-

tributions that were biologically advantageous and those that may more properly be called social in their operation. In either case the organism received indirect benefits, assistances of environmental origin, but in our more sophisticated period, to do justice to the modern family, we seek to distinguish for the purpose of emphasis contributions that more directly affect the working of the body from those which have psychic importance, both in the life of the individual and in that of the group.

The inconsistency of the family as an organization for survival is not peculiar to it under the conditions of highly developed civilization, for the same thing is true of other environmental situations. For example, the food needs of the body are more easily met by the highly developed modern type of agriculture than by the cruder methods of production characteristic of primitive society; but, advantageous as bounty is compared with meager, insufficient sources of food, the quantity created by our more skillful farming easily takes an unexpected turn and becomes disadvantageous to some particular individual. He may suffer from overeating or from an unbalanced diet, due to the ease with which appetite may be stimulated beyond personal needs, or he may be led to an excessive selection of something that has become favored by an artificial development of taste.

Moreover, the world-wide aspect of agricultural production may bring to some individual farmer emotional strain through worry and feelings of insecurity, so that, as far as he personally is concerned, the burden on his organism of a feeling of economic insecurity may more than offset the fact that he is living in a time when, as compared with his very distant predecessors, he enjoys a large and varied food supply.

There is another feature associated with the possible stress of familial experience under modern conditions that is steadily overlooked. Our culture assumes in its characteristic attitudes marriage, family life, and parenthood. Even though this statement may not have the fullness of meaning that it would

have had at an earlier period, it is still true that social conventions make a family career the expected, that is, the normal happening in the life of the individual. As a consequence, it is not easy for an individual who reaches maturity to take a purely negative attitude toward family responsibilities. There is strain ordinarily both for those who assume parenthood and for those who do not; for those who establish a home and for those who refuse to do it; for those who marry and also for those who for one reason or another remain single. The strain of the positive program is most likely to win our attention, but reactions to the prospect of loneliness and to the feeling of an uncompleted life-career are truly as burdensome as those that are associated with sensitive, conscientious parenthood.

In both cases the entrance that family influence makes into the higher biological functioning of the organism is, in great part, through the emotions. Although these are occurrences that rest upon physiological processes, they seem in consciousness to arise from environmental causes or to express themselves as effects upon the out-of-the-self world. As they operate within the body, their biological purpose has been to further survival, but this original adjustment has been disturbed by the evolution of consciousness, so that a strong emotion in all its reverberations may be an attack upon rather than a defense of the organism.[6]

Although on the human level the physiological mechanisms associated with such strong emotions as anger and fear do not carry on with their one-time survival efficacy, it is not because they have suffered loss of force as a consequence of human evolution but rather that the environmental situation is so changed as to give them less chance to operate in their former typical, helpful way. These emotions direct attention to the changing character of the struggle for human survival, something that has to be taken into account in any effort to interpret the modern family.

[6] R. G. Hoskins, *The Tides of Life*, pp. 41-42; George Crile, *Diseases Peculiar to Civilized Man*, chap. 1.

Ego survival

Under usual circumstances modern men and women are not made conscious of the effort they are continuously making for survival. As a rule, the complex, intricate reactions and adjustments that the organism has to carry on to perpetuate itself do not attract attention, but instead the individual's feeling of struggle is associated with experiences that are realized psychically. It is the ego rather than the body that establishes the notion of struggle. The circumstances that endanger the life appear to be those that challenge the security of the person, the conditions that throw off or deny self-satisfactions. It is true that the contact is with the environment, but, as is true of the body, the reactions that constitute struggle are within the ego, and failures and successes are registered in the individual consciousness. In any case, human survival takes on a complexion quite different from that of animal life, lacking self-consciousness, and this variation fundamentally alters the meaning of survival.

On the ego level of survival the family plays a large role. Not only does it furnish to a considerable extent in the formative period the conditions that influence the construction of the individual ego, forming the particular survival program through the development of a personal system of expectancies and satisfactions, but also it becomes, especially in the young child, supremely decisive in the person's feelings of success or failure. In other words, the ego cradled in the home leaves it emotionally secure or precarious. The consequential reactions are determined not by objective facts but by subjective feelings as the child associates with the family members.

The power that the family later maintains in the adult's career is rooted largely in the underlying, persistent childhood feelings of confidence or insecurity. So many possibilities exist that there is no simple way of describing the role of the family in its effect upon ego survival, for its effects range in individuals from next to nothing to such a compelling control of

later destiny that we can rightly say that emotionally the child-adult unceasingly continues, usually without success, to carry on throughout life his first battles for ego self-assertion in the atmosphere that prevailed in his own home in his earliest years. So much attention has been paid to the failures of the family to encourage wholesome human adjustment that it is easy to lose sight of the fact that the ego must survive in some sort of social setting comparable to the family, and that there is no way of evading the situation that for good or ill registers in later life in the personality as it seeks ego survival.

Ego survival stands in contrast with the continuous adjustment the body makes to live in the fact that it is so frequently conscious. Biological struggle may attract the attention of consciousness, using for the most part pain as its means of awakening awareness of its difficulties. Egoistic experience by its nature finds its existence in consciousness. Commonly this experience consists of feelings engendered by rivalry with some personal competitor, inadequacy in meeting a social situation, or real or fictitious failure to reach expectations. In any case, the ego's struggle is ordinarily more common and sharper in consciousness than anything that comes from the effort of the body to maintain its integrity.

This constancy of self-consciousness in the effort for security and success in ego-life provides a large opportunity for the family to build its influences in the growing personality from the earliest days of infancy forward. The family also normally provides the most intense feelings of rivalry owing to the intimacy and the emotional character of home association. These reactions that build up or destroy feelings of success or failure, confidence or insecurity, are ever-changing in the form they take, always responding to environmental conditions, the actual or supposed response of others, and especially to circumstances that are characteristic of the age of the person, both biologically and socially. It is the ease with which the effects of family relationship become cemented into the growing personality that makes the scientist dealing with adult maladjustment so fre-

quently put the blame upon the home. The family, however, assumes a necessary human liability, and any substitute for it would encounter the same hazards.

It is, of course, not true that this emotional influence of the family is significant only for the growing child, for it has its adult significance also, especially when the older person is in large measure still fighting for a sense of ego survival, an endless conflict which started in his one-time childhood experiences. The striving for ego satisfaction then takes place on two fronts as the parent tries to meet the conditions confronting him because of the presence of the child and because of the continuation of his own earlier struggle. It is not strange that some parents bring together the two contests, forcing the child to become a symbol of the parent-childhood career, a vicarious repeater of experiences that have come to have supreme emotional value in the parent's life-effort to establish self-esteem.

Since the growing personality must have a social environment, there is no escape from a series of reactions in association with others that, because of their emotional significance, help fill the egoistic and social character of the person. Even the potential endowments such as speech cannot develop in a vacuum but must have an association which, because of the nature of the child, is necessarily highly emotional, an affection-arousing or a hostility-building fellowship. Self-consciousness, by providing opportunity for the contact of the child with others, leads to the building of habits of behavior that may constantly trouble personality, creating frustration, or so operate upon others as to bring indifferent or even hostile reactions. When this misfortune occurs, the ego is weighted down as the child strives to prove to himself at least that he can dominate adverse circumstances and maintain his superiority and success. His incapacity becomes an incentive which throws him constantly into a conflict where he rarely wins victory even when to the outsider, who is judging unemotionally and objectively, his success seems clear. The victim of such early frustration can never gain an objective appraisal of his life, and if the bitterness of failure

becomes chronic, he is enslaved by his reactions to life and commits himself to some program of persistent social antagonism.

The necessity of a group background for the making of personality appears in the part that the attitude of others plays in the construction of individuality. The person can make no entrance into social experience and can, therefore, have no contact such as is needed to awaken his own self-consciousness unless he has opportunity to get the reaction of others toward him, the attitudes that bring him social- as well as self-consciousness.[7] This interplay in creating and developing awareness of others provides the basis of communication, the indispensable condition for thinking. Although it appears clearest in the life of the child in his formative period, it continues to operate, giving substance to personality throughout the adult career.

There is always, moreover, the feeling of identification, usually with various special groups, each of which brings to the individual a set of attitudes which he recognizes and to which he responds. His reactions, therefore, are those common to the particular group which he enters as an ally, and he develops a sense of special relationship with them through ties of common interest. This cementing experience is illustrated by the political, national, vocational, and religious groupings in which a basic emotional feeling of relationship rather than any common thought or purpose ties together those in association.

The first natural grouping, however—the family—stands by itself in the strength of the emotional reactions that come from the sense of identity discussed in detail in the next chapter. Necessarily this gives the family at first a monopoly of the influences that directly condition the child's psychic development. His first stirrings toward an independent career, a personality of his own, take place within the family arena, and he has no choice but to react to the circumstances that make up his home environment. Each family provides a unique setting, the reception the child receives ranging from excessive indul-

[7] George H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society*, p. 156.

gence to severe repression. Whatever he encounters, it is for him introduction into life, and it is not strange that these first happenings have such persistent emotional meaning that at times in our culture they become destiny-deciding events, shaping not only childhood but also the adult career. At the very dawn of life the ego gains or fails to get the emotional survival values that from that time insure a basic confidence or a never-passing sense of insecurity.

It is important in any effort to understand the emotional significance of the early life of the child that we keep in mind his impulse to assume the role of the adults with whom he has fellowship. His earliest self-consciousness, that is, his awakening to ego personality, appears not in his thought about himself but in the attempts he makes to assume the attitudes and to carry on the activities of those who have won his attention. This explains why he is so apt at first to speak of himself in the third person.

This awakening is more than mere imitation. There are also evidences of an emerging social self. These first reactions are composite experiences that may be interpreted from the meaning they have in the development of the self, or they can be looked at as the first fruits of the socializing process. They are both, because the personality comes into being through contact with others, and society maintains itself because the individual has the impulse to conform to the group. This at first is a simulation which reveals that the attitudes of others are beginning to register in the way that makes human communication an asset to the new order of development, an opportunity for the growth necessary to establish ego survival and the continuity of group life. It is, indeed, true that the child becomes through his own impulses a parent to himself,[8] but it is also true that he tutors himself as a means of joining society. This awakening comes from stimulations brought forth by the intimate relationships within the family.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

The family and social survival

The socializing aspect of family functions deserves to be separated from family child-care activities and to be valued by the importance it has for the maintenance of the social order. The group has interests that must be served or it disintegrates. It must draw individuals within itself and make them supporting personalities, and necessarily the accomplishing of this by educational processes has to start with the emergence of consciousness and proceed in association with the developing sense of self. Society must have for this purpose an elementary, co-operative unit, and the one provided by parent-child reaction is most serviceable. Thus the family group provides the basis for the larger organization of society; but this is not, however, to be thought of as a consequence in a time sequence, but rather the ongoing of two processes simultaneously awakened which analysis, for the purpose of emphasis, distinguishes.

Primitive society reveals clearly the indispensable social function that the family assumes. It is not an accretion added to the home but an activity that comes into existence by the very necessity of the family members experiencing relationship. As an organization, the family is inherently social, and the impact of one of its individuals upon another not only builds personality but also creates the necessity for a specific social order, thus giving the child the elementary teaching through normal contacts within the home that is the basic requirement for the existence of society outside the home. From this viewpoint the family as an experience becomes the nucleus of society, a nucleus, however, that contains momentum for growth toward great complexity.

The strength of family sentiment, the feeling of intimacy it engenders, and the ease with which essential activities gather about it, make it, as Lowie has said, the omnipresent social unit.[9] This quality that marks the family, making it a social unit because it is an emotional unit, comes from its functions rather

[9] Robert H. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, p. 66.

than from any sophisticated realization of itself. Even in the absence of the physiological knowledge necessary to establish biological paternity, the individual family assumes its sociological role because of social necessity.[10] Society has as great need of the family for its survival as has the individual. The ongoing of culture requires the functioning of the family as certainly as do the physical welfare of the offspring and the emotional demands of the self.

We have a vivid example of the emotional need of protection during the infancy period in the case of a young chimpanzee, who, for a time removed from her mother, was brought up in association with a child of nearly the same age.[11] The animal, called Gua by the experimenters, showed a double need: first, that required by the human offspring, whose survival depended upon the physical care of his parents; and second, a psychological need which appeared most forcefully. This was first seen when the chimpanzee was removed from her mother and forced to turn to those who took care of her physical necessities. She was especially fearful of being shut off by herself. If she happened to be on one side of the door and one of her friends on the other and any attempt was made to shut the door, she flew through, crying as she went. Her response to care, at first generalized, soon became specifically attached to those who gave her attention. Her fear of being left alone and her feeling of loss of support brought expressions that to one unfamiliar with her behavior would have seemed a temper tantrum, but which were in fact a fear tantrum. Even the organism, through reflex movements, revealed how tremendous was her reaction when in a state of panic she felt her physical or psychological support menaced. Environmental occurrences such as an unexpected noise acted upon her as if for the moment she had lost all sense of security, and she demanded reassurance, in contrast with the human infant with whom she was associated.

[10] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, p. 202.
[11] W. N. and L. A. Kellogg, *The Ape as a Child*, p. 157.

If the family is a biological necessity it is also a social expedient. Were there no family unit provided as the means of caring for the interests of reproduction and nurture of offspring, society, for its own purposes, would need to bring into being a similar arrangement for binding together, in small groups, persons who through their intimate meaning to one another would have strong emotional ties. In any case, the natural order has provided the type of co-operating group needed for its own security. Thus the family becomes a maintenance organization for the perpetuation of culture. This does not mean that the family is the one indispensable source of all things social, but rather that, being a primitive, biological relationship, it not only antedates other associations but also becomes a unit of interest out of which other associations can develop.

It is certain that of all human ties, the most deep-seated and universal are, as Hobhouse suggests,[12] those of sex and parenthood. These organized into a family structure give us the most durable of all our associations. As a consequence, society, the most inclusive and complex of all our organizations, takes advantage, for its own purposes, of this firmer, more intimate, and more substantial clustering of persons—the family.

The by-product of the family, marriage, becomes from inherent necessity an achievement of co-operation between the two separated sexes, male and female. This fundamental division often reveals through incompatibilities and marital adjustments the demands that it makes upon the two fundamental types of humans as a prerequisite for family stability. The survival of the race is at stake and therefore, as one would expect, there are impulses to drive the two sexes toward union as well as those that emphasize difference and, by gathering undue strength, turn what needs to be a fellowship into a conflict. The relation of the parent and child is similar. They, too, have opportunity for cleavage, tension, and collision, even though their differences are less spectacular than those that create the gulf between the male and female.

[12] L. T. Hobhouse, *Social Development, Its Nature and Conditions*, p. 40.

Sex relations in themselves do not furnish a substantial basis for fellowship, but as soon as there is a semblance of family organization, there are incentives for the transforming of the natural attraction of the sexes into a motivating force for the building of a co-operative relationship. It may, indeed, be true that a woman with an infant in her arms is what we see as far back as our investigation will lead us,[13] but this fundamental relationship requires the annexation of a man, and this turns the family into a functioning social unit.

Reproduction brings the man and woman together, since in their passionate partnership the germ of life passes on and survival of the race is assured, but this in itself would provide no basis for an organization that could carry on socially. Union of the sexes, in contrast with mere physical mating, is linked with and stabilized by the economic advantage provided by a functioning family. In spite of the sentiments and ideals that have flowered from sex co-operation in the more advanced civilizations, the material advantage of the partnership was the force that welded together man and woman and made them co-laborers within the family circle.

Division of labor followed sex lines, thus acting, as we clearly see in primitive society, as a union-making influence.[14] Co-operation in work provided the basis for an abiding partnership. In this way material needs, by utilizing sex differences as a basis for a more effective program for self-maintenance, strengthened the family organization. Even the crudest and simplest economic co-operation contained an elemental social experience, the means of alliance between the family and the greater society within which the individual family had its being.

Effects of economic co-operation

There cannot be the necessity of co-operation without at least the possibility of intermittent feeling of conflict. The

[13] W. G. Sumner, *War, and Other Essays*, p. 43.
[14] Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, p. 1508.

tension aspect of the matrimonial alliance has been frequently expressed, for it is one of the most ancient of recognitions. No one has described it better than William G. Sumner in his statement of "the antagonistic co-operation of the sexes."[15] The introvert Amiel, who wrestled so desperately with his personal impulse toward, and repulsion from, love, described this element inherent in the relationship of men and women in the more violent exclamation, "Life sometimes seems to be a contract of mutual persecution between the two sexes."[16] This same conflict of interests arises from time to time in the association of parents and children.

Modern life in myriad ways tends to exaggerate this collision of purposes that in mild or serious form appears in the home just as it does in marriage. It is the accompaniment of the need of co-operation among persons intimately and affectionately related and is not unlike other social co-operations except in its inevitableness and intensity. To think of it merely as conflict is to give it a narrow and negative interpretation. It is fundamentally an educating process, a socializing of individuals within small groups where personal desire and feeling are most frankly expressed. The more complex, suggestive, and variegated the out-of-the-family culture is, the more incentive does the individual feel toward self-expression, and the most inviting outlet for this is the family. This does not mean that a highly developed competitive individualistic civilization creates tension, but rather that it brings to the surface what was inherent in the relationship of persons bound together, whether by matrimonial ties or by family affection.

The complexity of the economic system associated with highly developed civilization encourages specialization that antagonizes the productive partnership of the family associates. Especially is this true for households living under industrial and urban conditions. This breaking down of family economy was

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 1516.

[16] Henri-Frederic Amiel, *Philine*, p. 94; T. H. Van de Velde, *Sex Hostility in Marriage*.

one of the first and oppressive consequences of the industrial revolution.[17]

In contrast to the tendency in highly organized industrial society to separate the interests of a household and to assign responsibility for earning the income, distributing it, and directing its consumption, to different members of the family, we have, in spite of sex specialization, in more simple societies, an industrial order that magnifies the importance of the family as a co-operating union. For example, among the New Zealand Maori[18] we find production and distribution concentrated within the family. Each member of the family makes his contribution to the general supply and draws upon it according to his needs.

This familial partnership, despite the high development of capitalism and machine production in modern culture, persists to our own time and once, notwithstanding the rise of factories, was dominant in the United States. A part of the instability of the American family is due to the trend away from this type of home and the coming of the other sort of family that separates and magnifies productive and consumptive responsibilities.[19]

The family and group interests

If we turn to the Maori family system, we see how naturally this elemental social unit is incorporated within the larger village community. Some undertakings demand more working power than the individual family can supply.[20] Communal services, carried out on a large scale, such as agricultural and fishing activities, are needed. As a consequence, the salient features of the household economy are carried over into the group programs for production. Distribution of the food material gathered requires an out-of-the-family organization, a regulation

[17] J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Rise of Modern Industry.*

[18] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori,* pp. 274-275.

[19] E. R. Groves and W. F. Ogburn, *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* p. 21.

[20] Firth, *op. cit.,* p. 275.

of procedure, and a public opinion that safeguards this mechanism of apportionment.[21] Thus, in so limited a field as economic production, the family becomes allied with a society, a public system, and a group opinion that seek to protect common interests.

The communal code necessarily develops into a social routine supported by a continuing tradition. In the same way other interests recognized within the family are carried into the social order, leading to a reciprocal support of out-of-the-family culture and domestic experience. The two fields of interest—the home and the community—can be separated and distinguished, but in no culture now known to us can one be found creating the other, since they are always found co-existent, each recognizing and using the resources of the other.

A similar illustration of the working together of family and society may be found in a distinctly different line of cultural development—religion. For example, in one of the most magic-saturated cultures in primitive Africa, we find the family, because it is the social unit of the people, contributing to the development and maintenance of the spiritual system of the people.

In Major Leonard's interpretation[22] it is evident that one of the most constant obligations of the family is maintenance of the ceremonies, taboos, and beliefs that characterize this exceptionally dominating spiritual concept of life. As an illustration of this, the confinement of the woman, one of the most impressive of domestic events, has a significance in magic that dominates its physical aspects.

> In keeping with accepted beliefs, it is usual for women, previous to their confinement, to supplicate the mother goddess of the household or community; and as soon as the suppliant, armed with manillas or cowries to the value of five shillings, also a sacrificial fowl, presents herself before the deity, the priest, who is there to receive

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 270.
[22] A. G. Leonard, *The Lower Niger and Its Tribes.*

her, throws some water on the ground, and, taking some wet mud from the spot, he rubs it over her abdomen as well as on her forehead. This done, he invokes the aid of the goddess in order to protect the life of the woman, but more especially at the time of her confinement, so that she may be safely delivered.[23]

Indeed, the whole domestic system implies the system of magic.[24]

Social survival and child training

The family becomes not only a contributing agency for the carrying on of social activities, but in simple life, as in our complex civilization, it is charged with activities within itself that are expected to protect group interest. This contribution of the family to social survival appears chiefly in the training that it gives the child. This may be purely routine, accepted as a matter of course, but this lack of consciousness must not hide the fact that what the family is doing is to give the social order an effective support through the disposition and practices of children who within a brief time, as adults, must be carriers of culture.

The child during his growth period is furnished with cultural possession, is led toward cultural attitudes, and is taught his responsibility for making cultural contributions. This third element in his preparation for life is fortunately rendered easy because of impulses of imitation, particularly in play. The infancy period, with its highly emotional intimacies of parents and child, provides great scope for the natural eagerness of the latter to play the role, first of his parents and then of other adults.[25]

This play impulse, which prevails even among the higher animals, is so universal as to lead some to think of it as possessing as its chief biological purpose preparation for later adult activi-

[23] *Ibid.*, *pp.* 412-413.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 414.
[25] Mead, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

ties.[26] Human experience makes it clear at least that this play of children has a profound socializing influence and meets an inner need that leads the isolated child to make use of it as a substitute when he is without the opportunity to associate with other children.

The domestic enforcement of the social order is not merely the passing of responsibility from parent to child but is, as it functions, a reciprocal enterprise, the parent being himself socialized in the process of training the child. This double function is inherent, since the very effort of the parent to inculcate whatever he gives the child forces him to have regard for some sort of social system.

As a rule, the family, through its training function, becomes conscious of its dependence upon the social order. It protects and distributes culture because the practices and accumulations of society have come to have value, in most cases as a consequence of the training process that the adult himself receives while a child. In this fashion society perpetuates itself.

The family, being by nature the most effective educating force in the formative years of the child's life, looks outward and attempts to anticipate the needs the child has for adjustment to the established beyond-the-home civilization. The family usually becomes so permeated with tradition that it is the chief support of the social order. Thus it tends to be conservative, even an obstruction to social change. As a consequence, revolution, any rapid reconstruction, finds the family its greatest opponent, and progress out of the family, however slow its development, has an easier method of advance than it finds within the domestic sphere. Always, in the long run, the family must be converted to a new order and enlisted in its promotion, for, however forceful the social innovation, it gradually loses its momentum and characteristic features when it encounters the inertia or even the active opposition of the family. The survival of any culture, whether new or old, requires a working alliance with the family.

[26] Karl Groos, *Play of Man.*

IV. *The Incentive of Identity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

INCENTIVES TO DOMESTIC SENTIMENTS AND ACTIVITIES. The lengthening of the infancy period, however well grounded it may have been in the changes of the biologic organism, did not proceed without accompanying psychic and social consequences. It was not a process void of meaning until it had reached a considerable distance between animal and mature human development. Instead, if like other evolutionary occurrences, it must have been also a growth in culture experiences encouraged by incentives called forth under the circumstances from the emerging human nature. Thus it became not only a specialized expression of an original instinctive motivation but also one stimulated by domestic relations, so that each advancement in the meaning of the mother-child relationship gave added momentum to still greater progress.

These encouragements that both took advantage of the lengthening period and in turn added to its development were the incentives that we need to distinguish and evaluate in order to understand the modern family and its functions. They were primitive motivations that, in accord with the existing social pattern, appeared within the domestic unit. They conserved and furthered social as well as individual interests, and their analysis helps us uncover the social purposes of the family. We are interested in the lengthening of the infancy period not merely because of the possibilities it brings when it arrives at the stage where it offers new unanimal-like opportunities for parent-child contact, but because it reveals the task given the family on its human level, its functioning for both individual and social interests.

The family as an organization still profits from these incentives stimulated by the securities and satisfactions associated with domestic relationships. Although the incentives cannot be given the mechanical or forceful role of instincts, they show us in the realm of consciousness the forces at work that carried the family from what it is on lower animal levels to what it offers in its human stages.[1] This does not mean that we should expect to find the incentives leading to the higher type of family experience strong and well formed in the beginning of the process. The incentives gain through their own growth, eventually reaching definite, self-conscious expression.

The incentive of identity

We have every reason to suppose that existence in isolation has always been as painful to humans as it is obstructive to social organization. As we have seen from our study of the motives of human conduct, the tendency of men and women to group themselves cannot be credited to a single major impulse, the so-called herd instinct. The sex impulse also forbade comfortable isolation even if it did not contribute, as it undoubtedly did, to some permanency of relationship of individual men and women. In fact, human development made possible a socialized experience that was furthered by all the major motivations of human conduct and that enlarged the meaning of each.

Association must always have worked as it does now to awaken the needs in each individual that require for fulfillment contributions from others with whom contact has been established. One of the forms this takes is the recognition of common interests and the need of co-operation to secure them. Social contact from prudential motives forces the realization in the individual in some degree of what from our sophisticated point of view we can best define as identity. In the domestic sphere this recognition of common relationship had an even stronger force behind it—the mother-feeling toward the child.

[1] George H. Mead, *Mind, Self and Society*, p. 238.

Here certainly, before it was broken by the more elaborate social development of man, a definite and powerful instinct was at work to force the realization of the identity of the child and mother in the consciousness of both. So strong is this feeling of identity even now that many interpreters insist that the fundamental socializing influence is the parental or at least the mother instinct.

The recognition, in some form, of sameness between individuals has a large place in present-day society and has been given various interpretations. Possibly the clearest and most convincing of these has been Giddings's "consciousness of kind." This description stresses sameness, a basic feeling of common likeness that is enforced by the realization of differences. The principle cannot be limited to racial or national aggregation, it so constantly appears in human experience.

The birth process and identity

Of all possible identities, that associated with the birth process is the most substantial and significant. Since this is true, it reveals how far away from his basic social origins civilized man has been in his studies of himself, that serious consideration of the meaning of birth as it affects human conduct is so recent. Birth cannot be rightly thought of as an instantaneous thing but as a process.[2] It ranges over a considerable period of time, signifying to each person concerned with the event something definite and unique. It also has two meanings. In one, the individual is ushered into life; in the other, the father welcomes another in whose procreation he has participated, or the mother looks upon the child whose life she has made possible. In the time taken for conception to reach its fulfillment much happens to stress the kinship that rests fundamentally upon the biological birth cycle.[3] No other relationship seems so close an identity, or

[2] Kingsley Davis and W. Lloyd Warner, "Structural Analysis of Kinship," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 39, No. 2, p. 292.

[3] *Ibid.*

under normal circumstances, so laden with reciprocal influences of person upon person as this tie associated with birth. Even the husband and wife, unrelated by blood, because of their mutual parenthood have, under normal circumstances, a sense of belonging to each other that is rivaled only by the similar experience of parent and child.

This firm recognition of identity, brought forth by the biological career of man, is unquestionably the rudimentary socializing relationship. It forces the birth process to become something more than the result of copulation of the sexes. It demands a co-operation in carrying the responsibilities of gestation and parturition that encourages the permanent feeling of union indispensable to the organization of the family.[4]

The concentration of identity that gathers about birth brings a recognition of identical interests, of one belonging to another, that spreads as a consequence of the routine of life into other associations. It is interesting to see simple illustrations of this expansion as they occur in primitive types of social organization. For example, we are told that among the Australian Kariera the whole social structure is built upon this recognition of consanguineous relationship.[5]

We even have terms that express the identity of interests in spite of the difference of biological function. The *couvade* so frequently found in primitive society is one example of this. The father assumes the personality of the mother, possibly because he thus saves her from risks of malicious magical influences.[6] This method of defense, which has been so persistent as to continue in mild expression down to present-day practices of the European peasant, is a fictitious substitution of personality that emphasizes the identity of the parents as they are concerned with the potential child. In similar fashion we have practices that enforce the identity of godparents and children.[7] And

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 293.
[5] W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior*, p. 99.
[6] Ernest Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, p. 425.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 440.

what is more important for the insight it brings to the students of social phenomena is the spreading of the idea of parenthood by means of a feast given to unrelated children of the village by fathers and mothers whose children are sick. Here also we find fear operating as a motive, since the parents are seeking to substitute the defenses of healthy children as a foil against the attacks brought by the evil spirits on their own child who is in danger.[8] It represents, however, at least in some degree, the idea of spreading an identity.

In still clearer form in modern life we see in adoption the emotional meaning of blood ties and the necessity, for the welfare of the child, of providing him with the same sense of identity with his foster parents that normally comes to a child born into a family. Experience has proved that it is not safe to take the child from a bad home, however lacking in economic, moral, and intellectual standards, and through institutional care provide only what his home has lacked. There is still greater need of bringing a sense of belonging, a genuine substitute for kinship. Social case work has demonstrated that when this is forgotten the child profits little or may be even more seriously injured by a transference that from every other viewpoint seems desirable. This fact has led to a proper hesitation on the part of experienced social workers to take children from homes where the feeling of identity is strong although conditions from other viewpoints are unfavorable. Not only must the strength of birth ties be fully weighed, but in addition, if transference seems imperative, there must be for the good of the child a new establishment of identity. Failure to bring this about means an emotional neglect of the child, a failure that deserves to be called social malpractice.

Identity in simple society

Kinship as a notation of identity is both clear and strong in simple society. Malinowski has shown that its core is some idea

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 441.

of reproduction, no matter how fantastic its expression may be.[9] This concept thus rests upon a universal biological structure which supports variable social patterns reflecting differing social cultures.[10] The striking characteristic of these relatively simple social organizations is the definiteness of the concepts of relationship. The definitions of identity are neither ambiguous nor confusing to those acquainted with the systems of classification. This parity of relationship is maintained by linguistic devices that fix the status of the individual in his association with others. This terminology is functional in purpose, in accord with totem and taboo principles, distinguishing the family relatives, representatives of a basic, biological identity of reproduction.

Although the kinship terminologies define different relationships, each representing an identity, they are not coherent systems, since each rests upon a variety of disparate principles.[11] This has not only confused travelers but also has led to controversy in anthropological literature.[12] Since the identities may be of psychological or sociological origin, there is opportunity for interpretation emphasizing one or the other.[13] The one important fact is that the native in his practices finds himself in a definite relationship signifying different sorts of identities.

Family identity

Although biological ties stand out from all others in the establishing and maintaining of identities within the domestic experience, there are other influences that should not be disregarded. One of these may be designated as the food ties. The significance of the common nutritive interest of the family will be minimized

[9] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines*, pp. 168-207.

[10] Davis and Warner, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

[11] A. L. Kroeber, "Classificatory Systems of Relationship," *Journal Royal Anthropological Institute*, 39: 77-84.

[12] Robert H. Lowie, "A Note on Relationship Terminologies," *American Anthropologist*, N. S., vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 263-267.

[13] Alexander Lesser, "Kinship Origins in the Light of Some Distributions," *American Anthropologist*, N. S., vol. 31, No. 4, p. 715.

unless one keeps in mind the prominence that food-getting necessarily has in the psychic life of primitive people. There is a quantity of testimony to the large place that the satisfaction of physical hunger has in the imagination of the natives. For most of them the gathering of sufficient food is difficult, and their reactions tend toward the same emotional attention to food-getting that we find in the hungry convalescent child. This appears in the songs that center about food and also in their proverbs. Even when conditions change and there is a relative security, the old sentiments remain and are expressed in conversation, songs, stories, and proverbs.[14]

The vogue of the feast and its great social meaning also testify to the influence that scarcity of food material has had on the psychic life of most primitive people. An interesting example of the prominence of food is the statement that among the Bantu people the eating hand is called the right hand, even when it is actually the left hand.[15] Other values than the mere satisfying of hunger that have naturally gathered about food are its becoming the means of hospitality and its providing opportunity for gaining reputation and social power.

This emphasis on food, which is sought after in a direct manner contrary to what generally happens in our highly organized society, enhances family solidarity and stresses familial identity. The family is not merely, as a rule, the economic unit of reproduction. It is also usually the unit of food distribution and food consumption. Even when food materials are obtained by communal labor, they are, as a rule, distributed to families and consumed within individual households. For example, among the Maori we find agriculture carried on as a village enterprise, but the field is divided into plots assigned to families and the crops of these are given over to the several households.[16] In modern life also there is abundant testimony that when a family under the pressure of hardship has to co-operate as a unit

[14] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, p. 283.
[15] Dugald Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantuland*, p. 129.
[16] Firth, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

for economic survival, there is apt to be a stronger feeling of identity of interest than in the opposite condition of luxury.

This economic solidarity of the members of a family is looked upon by Le Play as a distinguishing feature of his *Souche* or stem type. The household assumes an insurance function which permits any member who becomes temporarily unfortunate in his efforts to maintain himself elsewhere to return to the homestead. Those who depart from the home-roof continue their right to participate in the property of the family but not to such an extent as to endanger the welfare of the heir who did not go away.[17]

Not only did countless American colonial and frontier families maintain a homestead-refuge for their scattered members, but in our own times, especially during depressions, we have seen a multitude of those unemployed, both as individuals and as married couples, make use of the old home as an economic harbor. Since the being together even of adult relatives in this manner is necessarily, on account of American domestic individualism and love of privacy, a source of strain, the fact that such returning to the homestead in times of trouble is accepted, even encouraged, shows how strong is the underlying feeling of economic responsibility of the family as a whole for its various members.

Those on the lowest economic level may most constantly reveal this feeling of identity as it expresses itself in a united struggle against poverty, but it does not follow that middle-class or wealthy families have lost this sense of interdependence. Recent depressions have proved the contrary as members of families previously secure have drawn together and given or accepted help which, since such behavior was uncharacteristic, even opposite to former attitudes and practices, was the more impressive in bringing out the strength of family identity. The homestead functioned as a refuge for them also in spite of their unfamiliarity with the privations that so frequently force the very poor to become household allies.

[17] C. C. Zimmerman and M. E. Frampton, *Family and Society*, p. 99.

Close contact and feelings of identity

Urban life has tended to erase the significance of proximity as a source of a feeling of identity. Secondary contacts have so large a place in the city that primary associations have tended to be crowded out, and even within the family itself they are faint as compared with what once was true. One of our ablest interpreters of the social function of the neighborhood[18] was forced to recognize the difficulty in modern urban life of maintaining vital neighborhood relationships.[19] Thus the prevailing cultural atmosphere of our time, generated as it is in the cities, leads to a minimizing of the influence of proximity in building the feeling of common likeness and interest.

In primitive society we find the situation reversed. The village is like a large family. Sometimes it literally is composed of persons tied together by blood or by marriage. Even when this relationship is lacking, it is easy to see how naturally the inhabitants of a small village cling together and how genuine is their sense of a common identity. Surrounded as they often are by enemies, their one security comes from their ability to hold together. Often this co-operation is as necessary for food-getting as it is for protection. This sort of experience is not far distant in time even in American culture, for we find a similar situation on the American frontier, wherever in our early settlements there was only considerable menace from the Indians.

This sense of identity, based upon proximity, sometimes shows itself in a curious but perfectly logical expression. The village, as among the Ewes of the west coast of Africa, may be held collectively responsible for the payment of the debt for which one of its members is responsible, and compensation or the giving of a hostage may be demanded of the village rather than of the family to which the individual belongs.[20]

[18] Robert A. Woods, *The Neighborhood in Nation Building.*
[19] Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *Young Working Girls,* p. 38.
[20] Wilson D. Wallis, *An Introduction to Anthropology,* p. 306.

Another illustration of this belonging together because of a sharing of a common settlement frequently appears in the native's attitude toward the stranger. Often the latter is defined as an outsider, one who does not belong to the village. It is interesting that the stranger may be made to belong temporarily by introducing him into the home or by permitting him to share a common meal. The offering and accepting of hospitality brings a momentary belonging that may be the only way by which the stranger's life could be saved.[21]

The influence of proximity has its largest opportunity in the home itself. In the modern situation this works in two directions. It is the cause of strain and incompatibility at times instead of a cementing force. This fact must not hide the more usual tendency of those closely associated by their mere staying together to feel common interest, to establish an identity born of interaction and intimacy. Even though there are other influences at work, such as blood ties, to create within the domestic circle the notion of identity, the effect of the mere living together of the members of the family must not be discounted. It can create even in our society, as we know from abundant testimony, the feeling of oneness among members of the family group, even when one or more of them do not share any blood relationship with the rest. Indeed, the hired man in our former rural economy, when he remained in a household year after year, as he frequently did, came to have a degree of belonging that was something more than his participation for wages in a common labor. Slaves in some families in the South before the Civil War frequently came to feel themselves in a peculiar way identified with the family which owned them, and the strength of this unusual sort of identity showed itself impressively in an extraordinary loyalty both during the war and later in the more disorganizing circumstances of reconstruction, and often also by their taking their master's surname as their own. As a rule, proximity helps to support family solidarity.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 313.

Ancestors and domestic identity

An influence that must be counted among those contributing to the feeling of domestic union is ancestor relationship. This has had such a prominent place in the cultural experiences of primitive people that it has been assumed by some as an evolutionary stage in the development of all religions. In modern life it is most clearly found as ancestor worship in China and Japan. It is clearly related on the simplest stages of human development with fear of the dead. Recent anthropological literature makes it clear that ancestor worship is not so simple or consistent as once was thought, but the evidence as to its importance in primitive society has not been lessened by recent investigations. Ancestors in varying degree are so associated with the daily life of primitive people that they have significance which it is easy for us, with a different point of view, to underestimate.

Malinowski tells us that in the standardized dreams of the Trobriands a prominent part is taken by the departed spirits, who appear in visions according to an expected routine.[22] True visions are separated from the false ones by the fact that in the former the spirits come bringing to a surviving relative a definite, important message. The weight of personal relationship in this ancestral contact after death is significant as another support of domestic identity. It is true that, as a cult, ancestor worship frequently takes a tribal rather than a family form. Nevertheless the vitality of the belief in ancestral relationship clearly becomes a memory of the departed which continues even after death has brought separation. We have illustrations in which this appears in such measure that it is thought that the souls of the dead remain in the land so long as they are remembered. Once forgotten, they go elsewhere.[23] The relationship between the living and the dead, whatever its form and its strength, expresses a feeling of identity that the modern man or woman, however distant from a cult-ancestorship, ought to be

[22] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. 2, p. 388.
[23] Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality*, p. 86.

able to understand. It rests upon a natural human impulse to feel that, as a rule, the quest of perpetuity flourishes best in the intimacies of family experience.

Even the atmosphere of modern civilization, for example, cannot prevent many in bereavement from having vivid dreams in which they associate once again with those whom they have loved. No one who has had this experience finds difficulty in realizing the credibility and the influence of such dreams among primitive folks. It even happens that under stress such dreams come to persons as if they were visits from former relatives who wanted to bring counsel in times of trouble. And so impressive may these dream states become to some individuals that they are permitted to direct decisions.

Among primitive people there are special events that are thought especially open to ancestral influences—as, for example, pregnancy among the Trobriands.[24] Family routine often is influenced by belief in the relationship of the living with the dead. We have such curious examples of this as the carving of wood vessels among the Eskimo being tied up with a complex belief in family ancestors.[25] However futile such practices as the offering of food materials to departed spirits may seem to the sophisticated modern, the significance of such expressions of a feeling of identity as the support of both tribal and domestic solidarity must not be discounted. The feeling that the living are individually tied to those who have departed does not exhaust the meaning of the belief in ancestral spirits as it affects the family. The fact that the former are linked together by their common relationships to ancestors also has significance, and this linkage is all the stronger because it is grounded in a mystic, extraordinary, unbreakable identity.

Identity based on confidences

There is an identity that strengthens domestic fellowship now, as in all mature civilizations, for which there seems to have been

[24] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. I, pp. 173-174.
[25] Clark Wissler, *The American Indian*, p. 88.

little opening or incentive in the earlier stages of human society. This is an identity so natural in the intimacies of family life that it is likely to be taken as a matter of course. It is the recognition of privacy and the feeling that because of common interests and ties one can confide in another. It is often absent from family experience, and husbands and wives and parents and children are emotional strangers to one another, concealing rather than expressing their inner selves. These failures to maintain an emotional identity constitute tragedies within the family that on account of their dramatic character draw the interest of the playwright, the poet, and the novelist.

No domestic experiment is so interesting in showing the significance of the identity of mutual exclusiveness as the marriage scheme of the Oneida Community. The founder, Noyes, had the disposition and the resources that made it easy for him to find good adjustment without the kind of emotional commitment that is usually needed before a sensitive person can lay bare to another his deepest feelings. Most of his followers were not so fortunate. Noyes recognized from the first that temptation to seek a peculiar intimacy was likely to prove the most dangerous attack upon his complex marriage system.

Although every effort was made by the Community to frown upon what was considered the most selfish of all the human cravings, the menace grew greater with the passing of time and with the lessening, especially in the younger members of the Community, of the early enthusiasm. Noyes' son has told us frankly how constant was the craving, especially in mother and child, for the normal intimacy of orthodox family life and how frequently in various ways both adults and children let out their hunger for a specific rather than a general emotional security. It is true that Pierrepont Noyes, looking back, testifies to his mature surprise that the child's desire for special affection was so largely rooted out.[26] His explanation is the constancy with which the elders tried to rub away the child's natural feelings. However, in other places in the story of his childhood,

[26] Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House*, p. 72.

the author reveals a normal hunger, and undoubtedly the greater response he received from his mother than from his father explains why she came to mean so much more to him.[27]

An interesting illustration of the recognition of identity of husband and wife appears in the principle of the common law which early made it illegal for one spouse to testify against another. Although many reasons have been given for this, the most plausible is that it was held that such testimony would be biased because of mutual marital interests and affection.[28] Also, such testimony would uncover personal confessions made in a spirit of confidence within the marital relationship and possibly, if permitted, would create caution against the openness necessary for genuine fellowship between husbands and wives. Thus we find the law seeking to encourage peace between spouses by refusing to force testimony that might lead to dissension and also recognizing the unwisdom of forcing evidence repugnant to the normal feelings.[29]

Most important of all was the principle of common law that usually made husbands and wives privileged and not competent to testify to marital communications on the grounds that this was good public policy tending to promote domestic confidence and freedom in the home.[30] There were other principles of identity in the common law based upon male headship in the home, but they had different motives from these that grew out of the naturalness of intimate communication in a fellowship where emotional identity naturally tends to express itself in frank confiding one to the other.

Nothing is clearer than that those who have lost spouses through death or divorce frequently suffer keenly because no longer do they have an identity that invites confidences. This craving for emotional fellowship is as deeply felt by many as lost sex relationship. This reaction shows how much of family oneness comes from a special, trustful confidence.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[28] Chester G. Vernier, *American Family Laws*, vol. 3, p. 584.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 585.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 586.

Totemic kinship

Pointing out the significance of totemic kinship is one of the most important contributions of modern anthropology. The term "totem" was first used in 1791 to describe the belief among individual Indians of the Great Lakes region that each had a supernatural protector.[31] Although in the colonial period the word was applied loosely to anything that the Indians regarded as of unusual value, the notion of kinship seems to have been from the beginning nearest to the thinking of the Indian himself.[32] As a result of discoveries that totems existed in other primitive cultures, the term came to be a basic concept in anthropological literature dealing with the simpler groups. We owe to Frazer especially our present insight. He defined the term as follows:

> A totem is a class of material objects which a savage regards with superstitious respect, believing that there exists between him and every member of the class an intimate and altogether special relation.[33]

Although totemism takes various forms generally classified as the sib, sex, and individual type, the underlying idea is that among the members of the same totem there exists a special relationship resting upon the notion of a common descent. This idea ranges from a direct ancestral origin to the possession of a name in common with other members of the totemic group. Even in this latter sense we find the feeling of brotherhood, a recognition of a special relationship.[34]

Concretely the totem exists as an animal, a plant, or a natural object toward which the natives show a special reverence or at least a peculiar attitude. Although its meaning, that is, the form

[31] Clark Wissler, *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*, p. 196.

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] From J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. 1, p. 3. By permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers.

[34] Clark Wissler, *An Introduction to Social Anthropology*, p. 206.

of the connection between the individual and his totem, differs widely in its many expressions, we do find the feeling of special relationship—the identification of the native with his totem—and, as a consequence, a sense of a common tie with others sharing his totem. When this identification is difficult, as, for example, when the totem is such an ephemeral or changeable object as the wind, the notion of totemic relationship fades and becomes only a remnant of a vital faith resembling the modern vogue of mascot or badge.[35] It has been said that the most primitive totemic peoples conceived of their relationship as members of a totemic brotherhood, not so much based upon historic descent as upon common substance.[36] The significant thing is that in spite of the greatest diversity in totemic systems, they always show a persistent idea of identity.

Totemic belief frequently, even usually, among simple peoples establishes exogamic limitations in mating. This regulation is not universal.[37] Hence, it is an exaggeration to insist that all peoples given to the totemic system regard each separate group as a family, so that the most distant grades of relationship are held to be an absolute barrier to sexual union.[38] This attitude, however, is so common that it is very nearly the rule.[39] It is the idea of identical relationship that is universal, and when this emphasizes the idea of common descent expressed in clan brotherhood, it is not strange that it so frequently establishes exogamy. Were it not that we can have clan exogamy without totemism, or the reverse, we would be driven to the conclusion of some that in the minds of preliterate people totemic descent and blood descent are always synonymous.[40]

It is not surprising to find the totem relationship having in primitive society, as a rule, enormous functional significance, for

[35] Robert Briffault, *The Mothers*, vol. 2, p. 461.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 477.

[37] Alexander Goldenweiser, "Totemism," *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 14, p. 658.

[38] Sigmund Freud, *Totem and Taboo* (Translated by A. A. Brill), p. 9.

[39] Alexander A. Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 285.

[40] Edward Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage*, vol. 2, pp. 181-188.

it became in its clan expression a cornerstone of group solidarity. Its value as a means of union was such that it has no duplicate in modern society.[41] The loyalties and other sentiments of co-operation and community interests and patriotism, which are so necessary in our culture and so assiduously cultivated, have never welded people together with the success of the clan brotherhood. It was an extension of family feeling that lost little as it was stretched beyond the domestic circle. It did not come by the weakening of family ties but rather by including, through a sense of identity, others outside individual homes so that they were, so far as emotional interaction was concerned, relatives.

The totem plan provided an inclusive fellowship, so that it is no exaggeration to say that it brought the feeling of relationship that in our society is found in family, brotherhood, nation, state, and religion.[42] Modern life has lost this strong feeling of identity as a means of uniting people. Even when such co-operation is obviously for the personal interest of modern people, it means constant struggle against disintegration born of overstrong individuality and a feeble sense of common possessions in economic, ethical, spiritual, neighborhood, and national interests. The nearest we come to something that resembles the one-time plan, identity through totemic likeness, is in family feeling. Domestic identity is our only spontaneous and easily maintained basic union. All others are supported by consciously directed educational propaganda.

Blood brotherhood

Frequently among primitive people, especially in Africa, there is found a special relationship which may be called *blood brotherhood* or *contract sealed in blood*. Although it varies, as one would expect, in significance and in the rites by which it is established, it always includes the exchange of blood in some

[41] Briffault, *op. cit.*, pp. 491-492.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 493.

form, thus suggesting a purposeful extension of the idea of hereditary kinship. It is as deliberately established as marriage and carries with it obligations as definite and as strong, as a rule, as those associated with matrimony.

It is a reciprocal relationship, and the mutual obligations assumed by those who are brought into blood union are too precise and enduring for the relationship to be thought of as something corresponding to our friendship. Although this feeling may be the motive that leads to its establishment, its meaning seems more correctly interpreted as a sort of contract alliance for future protection or advantage.[43]

Blood brotherhood flourishes most among African natives, but it appears elsewhere.[44] Often its function is such as to make it seem a sort of insurance policy. It provides future protection and thus becomes the means of guarding against possible menaces. It also brings advantages in social and trade relations. This explains why explorers like Stanley have been eager to become blood brothers with the chiefs through whose territory they passed.[45]

The socially approved blood covenant is made by an appropriate ceremony. It is not entered upon by members of opposite sex, and rarely between persons of unequal social status.[46] The responsibilities that fall upon him who has entered upon a blood relationship are enforced by a public opinion that frowns upon failure to attempt reasonably and honestly to meet the obligations of the relationship.

The origin of the blood covenant is too far in the past ever to be known by science. It clearly suggests the descent of blood and is frequently interpreted as having the same significance as brother relationship within the family. Originally, it would seem that it was an extension of family identity either by adoption into the individual domestic circle or by a widening of the

[43] F. H. Melland, *In Witch-Bound Africa*, chap. VIII.

[44] I. H. N. Evans, *Among Primitive Peoples in Borneo*, p. 168.

[45] Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[46] E. E. Evans-Pritchard, "Zande Blood-brotherhood," *Africa*, vol. 6, pp. 369-390.

family so that its spirit was made to go outside its membership through the notion of a common descent. In any case, it is used to establish by choice the same sort of ties of relationship as those that are automatically enforced by a vital functioning of the family. It bears testimony to the natives' desire to build dependable loyalties by creating a sense of identity which, on account of accompanying rights and group sanction, would become as firm and as effective as those existing between real brothers. The need of such alliances reveals how socially indispensable the family was, since it provided in most circumstances even greater solidarity of interest among its members.

Ancestor worship

Another type of identity reveals the influence of the family setting. This also varies in form, in distribution, and in the strength with which it is maintained in the cultures where it exists. The totemic ancestor has already been discussed. Ancestor worship may free itself from totemic origin and carry on as a revering of family members who after death are held in memory by a domestic cult. We have to a degree a similar custom in modern life, as shown by the conventional attitude of respect that is taken toward those once honored who have died. The distinction is in the greater meaning that ancestors have, and in the ceremonies associated with their continuing honor, among peoples maintaining ancestor worship.

Again we find identity the essential feature of the relationship. Those who die do not pass out of the experience of their descendants because of the vivid feeling of identity on the part of the living with the dead—a feeling that seems to add to the significance of the latter to the former, as a result of a fatalistic notion of the power in the hands of those who have departed. Confidence in the wisdom of elders, notions of magic, belief in the power of ghosts, and fear of the dead, all may contribute to ancestor worship.[47] Westermarck states that in China and

[47] Westermarck, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-346.

Japan reverence for parents almost becomes ancestor worship. In both of these countries we find the most vital reverence of ancestors expressing itself on a complex cultural level. Not only does this traditional attitude link the immediate family with its predecessors; it also strengthens the home ties and influences the domestic behavior of husband, wife, and children. Baroness Ishimoto gives us a very revealing picture of family worship at the Feast of Lanterns, when, according to Buddhist tradition, it is believed that all the departed members of the family return for the three days of this festival. All the members of her father's home gathered in front of the family shrine as the priest came to carry out the rites prescribed for the worship of the dead. When the ceremony was over, the father went forward to the shrine and burnt incense. He was followed by the mother and each of the children, in the order of their ages, although the youngest was so little that he could hardly do his part.[48]

Adoption identity

Kinship established by adoption is common in our time, and we find this was true also in primitive cultures. Among the Polynesians adoption so changes the status of the child that his relationship brings about a reversal of the rules of taboo.[49] The American Indians held the idea that children who had died appeared again in those adopted into the family.[50] The motives for adoption vary. For example, we find among the Baganda the practice of sending the child away for adoption in order to protect him from the displeasure of the king or chief who for some reason might force him into slavery.[51] The conditions of

[48] Shidzué Ishimoto, *Facing Two Ways*, p. 26.

[49] Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

[50] J. O. Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Bur. Amer. Ethnol., Ann. Rep.*, vol. 3, p. 265.

[51] J. Roscoe, "Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vol. 32, p. 32.

primitive society, just as happens in our time, frequently made it necessary for someone to adopt the child to insure his survival.

Happily, we do not find among such peoples the orphan asylum, which we have found by experience in modern life to be an unnatural and ineffective environment for the growing child. Mothers died in childbirth, and either parent more often by war, by raids, and by disease, so that the child was left homeless, and the general practice was to adopt him. Sometimes this was done by near relatives, as with us, but this kinship was not necessary. Adoption itself provided relationship, replacing, if necessary, in whole or in part the blood ties established by birth.

Milk ties

Another identity of domestic origin is that established by nursing. Milk ties appear in some primitive cultures as equivalent to those resting upon blood descent. We have instances in which adoption is accompanied by the child's suckling the foster mother, thus becoming fully identified with the new home. Occasionally we find also the idea of identity based upon suckling so thoroughly regarded as a kinship status that children unrelated by blood but who had nursed the same breast are denied the right to marry one another.[52] We even have cases in which the milk ties are considered stronger than those of blood. The adopted child is held to be nearer the mother than her own child, if the latter has been suckled by a different woman.[53] Among the Nairs of India, a child whose mother has died is permitted to nurse a relative or even some outsider. The child then is as much the woman's as are those to whom she has given birth.[54] In one group it is customary to precede the rites of blood fellowship by the ceremony of

[52] Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.
[53] Jeoffrey Gorer, *Africa Dances*, p. 28
[54] W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, pp. 269-270.

milk brotherhood. A bowl is brought filled with milk to which is added breast milk drawn from one of the nursing women of the sib. After she has uttered an incantation with other ceremonies, the two persons to be united drink in turn from the bowl. Then the men go out of the hut to exchange blood in the open air.[55]

Sex kinship

The strength of domestic identity appears not only in its influence to consolidate but also in part in the encouragement it gives to the creating of other identities and loyalties that become rivals or at least destroy the monopoly of family bonds—whether real or, from our viewpoint, fictitious. In contemporary family life we see this principle working chiefly in the life of the adolescent, but not alone in this common readjustment forced upon the modern parent by the child's insistence on self-expression. Another example is the criticism that was directed against women's clubs when they first came into vogue in American culture, based upon the assertion that they divided the interest of women by drawing their attention away from the home. This judgment was justified if these critics wished the status of women to remain fixed according to masculine tradition.[56] Women were beginning to feel the atmosphere brought forth by a new social situation and as a consequence they were developing interests and sentiments that were an antidote to the home monopoly that the masculine-directed mores sought to enforce. Certainly primitive life reveals the various efforts to establish identities that compete with those of the family. Of these, the ones that emphasized sex differences and grouped men with men and women with women are the most significant. The enlargement of the meaning of identity based upon parent and child relationship, accompanied as it necessarily was with a more mature social

[55] Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-165.
[56] Ernest R. Groves, *The American Woman*, pp. 327-328.

experience, invited the clustering of interests along other lines than those represented by the home.

It was not strange that in this trend there frequently appeared emphasis upon sex differences. The division of labor, although advantageous to both men and women, enhanced their sense of sex separation, thus creating loyalties that cut across those associated with familial experience. The fact that males engaged in the spectacular and undoubtedly fascinating activities of hunting and war much more than did women would strengthen the notion of division between the sexes. It was often true in practice that the woman was expected to make a very responsible contribution of magic character while her husband was on the hunt or engaged in warfare, but this by its nature cut her away all the more from his experiences and added meaning to the distinction between the sexes. For example, the common notion that it was weakening for the man to go near the woman before and during his expedition gave greater significance to the gulf that the conventions established between men and women. The common belief that women had special magical powers, particularly as this was associated with menstruation, childbirth, and their sexual organs,[57] provided the strongest support to the customs and the ideas that grouped men and women according to their sex. Taboo not only operated in the same direction but undoubtedly came in part from masculine fear of the power of women and from the need and desire on the part of men to emphasize the differences between themselves and women. Certainly, as tradition in the modern sense has replaced taboo, this motivation has appeared.

Undoubtedly the two complementary principles of attraction and repulsion appeared early in human sex relations.[58] These contrary impulses are usually thought of from the man's point of view, but certainly in modern life they work as clearly in the attitude of women toward men as in that of men toward women. These dual forces play a large role in marital incom-

[57] Briffault, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 303.
[58] Crawley, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

patibility.[59] They stimulate the consolidation of each sex, thus establishing an identity which emphasizes other interests than those maintained by the domestic expressions of identity. Organizations among men featuring this stress of difference appear frequently in anthropological descriptions of the life of simpler peoples. Occasionally women also organize, and we see rivalry and even antagonism between groups of men and women, particularly when their organizations rest upon different totems. An example of this appears in the Kurnai tribe in Australia.[60]

There are other types of separation of the sexes that tend to build in each the feeling of common interests, a sexual identity. Some of the simpler peoples have a clubhouse which provides for the men a life apart from that carried on within their domestic circle. Others have organizations whose function it is to hold women in check, to keep individual women from becoming troublesome to their husbands or to other males, and to enforce the taboos and the traditions that keep women in an inferiority status.[61] The puberty ceremony, menstrual practices, the initiation, and especially secret societies, have emphasized sex differences and forced upon both groups the idea of sex identity.

It is impossible to think of sexual identity as something indifferent to family experience. This oneness is rather the product of contrast, the stress of other than domestic interests, the recoil from family concentration, in accord with the fundamental action and reaction behavior of the human being. The large place that sex necessarily has in marriage, so consistently recognized by primitive folkways, leads persons while responding to sexual attraction to develop also the sense of difference. Those sharing a common biologic character draw together, and each group feels its separation from the other and its need of the opposite sex, a need that at times becomes a compulsion so urgent that it is resisted by a concerted emphasis of sex one-

[59] T. H. Van de Velde, *Sex Hostility in Marriage.*
[60] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of Southeast Australia,* p. 148.
[61] Crawley, *op. cit.,* pp. 42, 43.

ness. Men, being more aggressive, reveal this reaction more frequently and more clearly in primitive society and even in modern society. It, however, is not a mere masculine trait, but is fundamental sex emotion in reverse.

Incest

Questions as to how incest originated seem to promise endless controversy. Although the marriage of persons in specific relationships constitutes one of the most universal taboos of primitive society, there is no consistency in the definition of the prohibitions. Ordinarily, as in modern society, sex relation is denied those who are close blood relatives; there are exceptions, however, not only in primitive cultures but also in the historic period. In the classical era there were more of these exemptions than is commonly supposed. Inbreeding has been too common in human experience to permit us to assign the conventional abhorrence of incest to an instinct. Moreover, such an explanation creates the difficulty that it would mean establishing on the human level an instinct that does not show itself among animals. This would require that during the evolutionary process, when specific instincts were generalized and incorporated into the habit behavior, an original instinct appeared and with no satisfactory explanation reversed the human movement away from the determination of specific instincts.

The evidence, both past and present, points to the conclusion that incest is an antipathy developed from social rather than biologic motivations. Even if it were clear that close inbreeding is harmful per se, it is asking too much of primitive insight to ascribe the feeling against incestuous relationships to eugenic convictions. The problem provides a virgin field for speculation, and as a result we have many widely differing theories. One fact emerges from all discussions, and that is the recognition that the sex mating of specific groups is socially disturbing. If these separations were always made according to our conventional notions, interpretations of the significance of incest

would be easy, for incest would follow the lines of close blood-kinship.

The protest against "identical" matings

Since magic and totemic grouping, as well as blood kinship, influence mating restrictions in the simpler societies, we are forced to a wider basis for the feelings that in our time make the sex relationships of those closely connected by blood socially unthinkable. We do find in some form a protest against sex relations between persons already, according to the prevailing ways, identical.[62] The form this disapproval takes depends upon what identities the individual tribe or clan has come to think unseemly. When the problem is related to family experience, a source from which we should expect the sharpest recoil against unconventional sex relations to originate, we find tendencies that throw light upon the functional purpose of incestuous regulations.

The family requires for its stability the assignment of the roles between its members. This feature of family experience is even more pronounced in primitive life than in our prevailing culture. Members of the family take their place, and each has to the other a definite relationship. This for husband and wife includes sex. These two, brought together in union, represent a fusion of different familial identities. Their oneness is an achievement, an alliance of persons who come together from different backgrounds. Sex, one of the motives drawing them together, helps to build a new identity as they share the specific relationship of marriage. To invite other members of the family into this same relationship would bring about two sets of identity, the child and parent then being bound together in kinship and through specific sex relationships. Experience has surely proved this disquieting, and increasingly so as self-consciousness

[62] William D. Strong, "Cross-Cousin Marriage and the Culture of the Northeastern Algonkian," *American Anthropologist,* N. S., vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 277-288; Briffault, *op. cit.,* vol. 1, p. 57, and vol. 3, pp. 26-27.

grew with the development of human culture. Fundamentally this means that the general trend would be toward a sex alliance that represented a new relationship rather than the extension of those already established by the membership of the individual within the family. We would expect to find this strongest as an antipathy to relationships between fathers and daughters and mothers and sons and between sisters and brothers, and this is true not only with the simpler peoples but in our own time.

The sex attraction of the unfamiliar

Much has been made by many of the students of incest of the tendency in sex attraction toward those with whom there has not been a long, intimate family familiarity. There are too many exceptions to this ever to allow us to consider it an instinct.[63]

Havelock Ellis bears testimony from his own experience to the ease and naturalness of sex attraction between brother and sister when they have been separated for a considerable length of time. He rightly says that the sex motive in such relationships intrudes oftener than is generally supposed. The marriage counselor occasionally has impressed upon him the intensity and persistency of such an attraction even when there has been no extended separation of the brother and sister. He also discovers that such experiences, even when they include overt sex intimacies, are by no means confined, as is so commonly supposed, to morons or to persons on the lowest levels of economic existence.

It is true, nevertheless, that sex attraction does tend toward the new and the different. This, in so far as it operates, encourages a division between family feeling, whether it expresses common interest or affection, and sex impulse. There are many motives, and there must have been from the beginning of human society, for the separation of familial emotions and passion, as

[63] See Havelock Ellis, *My Life*, p. 179.

children were trained to assume definite roles in the household unit. This separation, which now normally seems so natural, registers the effect of a long-continued social policy. Psychiatric searching of human experience proves that this gulf is neither so wide nor so easily maintained as surface facts would seem to show. Sex intrudes wearing disguises, and troubles even the modern family. It is here that we find one of the most prolific causes of jealousy and familial dissension. This would seem to show that sex impulse is driven by social pressure in early childhood toward out-of-the-family relationships. As a consequence, the individual looks forward to a mating that will mean not the carrying of an old identity to a new expression but the building through commitment and cohesion of a new and different sort of identity. Social culture, for reasons of expediency, such as the building of group solidarity, the tying together of the unrelated by marriage, the lessening of family tension by preserving single rather than double roles among the members, would have no choice but to enforce by various mechanisms of early folkways the protest which has matured into the conventional prohibition of incest.

The assumption of identity

Descriptions of the social life of primitive people abound with illustrations of fictitious kinship. They take a great variety of forms, and some of them show the spread of the principle of avoidance through the taking on of identity as a result of a marriage relationship. The strength of such taboos is interpreted by Sumner as evidence of the fact that earlier sexual relationships were carried on by relatives to whom such experiences are now forbidden by public opinion expressed in custom.[64] The most impressive of these avoidances is that between a man and his wife's mother. This is not only a common restriction but both exacting and strongly supported. The present popularity of jokes about the mother-in-law shows that

[64] W. G. Sumner, *The Science of Society*, vol. 3, pp. 2016-2017.

the significance of this in-law relationship is still emphasized by social attitudes, although these tend to stress the possibility of antagonism rather than attraction. Doubtless both occurred under the conditions of life among primitive peoples.

The in-law relationship represents the spread of identity as a result of a genuine connection. In addition to this assumption of identity, we have also among people of simple culture a large amount of what may be designated as artificial or fictitious relationships. This description is, however, misleading if it carries the idea that in those concerned there was any feeling that their belonging together was not real. Whether their connection was the result of adoption, or the sharing of blood, or even the ceremonial drinking of milk together, the feeling that followed was one of genuine identity.

Sometimes we find an effort to strengthen the common interests of the group through the spreading of identity by such practices as all the mothers in turn nursing the various infants. The suckling experience is supposed to, and in fact does, create the feeling of solidarity.[65] We also find among primitive folk a transference of identity. For example, the mother loses her special relationship by the child's being adopted by another woman or being cared for and suckled by the latter.[66] We have instances in which the woman who provides milk for the infant immediately takes on an identity similar to that of the mother by blood.[67] We even have accidental relationships, such as came to Livingstone when the blood from a tumor that he was removing from a woman's arm squirted into his eye and she exclaimed, "You were a friend before; now you are my blood relation!" [68]

These artificial relationships are no sign of looseness in the primitive mind in defining identity. Their significance, on the contrary, is in the revelation they make of such importance

[65] Briffault, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 596-607.
[66] *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 600-601.
[67] Sumner, *op. cit.*, p. 2026.
[68] Robert Livingstone, *Mission Travels*, vol. 2, p. 526.

being placed in identity that it cannot be limited merely to blood ties. In order to maintain solidarity of group life or to celebrate the new meaning that has come from association, an effort is made through ceremony and symbol to express or to encourage the feelings of identity. In modern patriotism we have a remnant of this. The interest in family genealogy is another expression of what once was an exceedingly important element in the building and maintaining of unity among primitive people. Recourse was had to the idea of identity as a cementing influence because this principle of belonging carried a conviction and a commitment of relationship that had no rival in the meaning it brought the primitive mind. The realization of oneness which comes naturally within the family is extended and used to establish the strongest sense of social identity possible.

V. *The Incentive of Perpetuity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

SPREAD OF KINSHIP IDENTITY. Kinship identity provides the chief basis for the psychic and social experiences that constitute the content of domestic relationships. The growth of intelligence associated with changes in a biologic organism gave greater meaning to the parent-child relationship. This appeared in part in a longer infancy period, during which the temporary parent-offspring commitment characteristic of animal life was prolonged. All that was needed to bring this about was the continuation of the instinctive reactions characteristic of higher animals until self-consciousness so intruded as to make it possible for habit to replace automatic impulses.

Even now, when parenthood is so largely conventionalized and laden with social coercion, there are suggestions of the one-time instinct status and, as a consequence, controversy between those who insist that there is an underlying parent instinct that persists amid the complexities of present domestic relationships and others who believe that instinct has been entirely dislodged and that the security of the child comes from the social conditioning of the parent. The fact that these two interpretations continue suggests that once instinct was dominant, as habit now is. The issue is whether instinct, so certainly supreme at one time, could be entirely effaced, even though it is admitted that for the most part the modern parent reflects in child relationships the influence of the culture to which he has been exposed.

The instinct upon which kinship identity rested, that is, the maternal commitment characteristic of the higher animals, could have a lessening function only as culture increased its effective-

ness in building parental habit. This would mean that the unconscious fixation of the mother that insures the care of the offspring gradually gave way to conscious feelings and practices encouraged both by individual impulse and social expediency. Only so could instinct find a substitute in a domestic routine that did for the human child what for so long instinct has been doing for animals. This greater meaning of kinship identity, as it developed, opened the way for additional incentives that in turn would influence and strengthen domestic experience. A greater quantity of parent-child identity created both need and opportunity for new qualities in the relationship. There was not only more of meaning in the connection of parent and child but also other than the original significance. Thus the family rests upon different strata that were laid down at various periods in the expansion of the child's dependency. Along with these changes went necessarily an accumulation of cultural wealth which would not only give resources for a higher type of social experience but at the same time would create in both individual and group desires that could not emerge during the preceding greater limitations. One of these incentives that has come to have an important part in the support of the family, appearing in both personal and social consciousness, is perpetuity.

Out-of-the-family pressure

Fundamental as are the direct psychic incentives that provided the greater content of the infancy period as it lengthened, there were also indirect utilitarian influences that, taking advantage of the growing opportunity of parent-child relationships, made use of the family as a social structure to bring about an increase of function that established the family as the chief economic and social unit. Although the content of the infancy period was gathered from psychic action and response, the family as an institution profited from human needs independent of this infancy relationship. These out-of-the-family interests gather

about two tremendous human concerns—economic and social security. The first made the family the unit of production. At least, when anthropologists began to study the then existing simple societies they found this economic organization generally prevailing. The second established the family as a social unit, the nucleus for the distribution of responsibility and the management of social interests.

The human craving for perpetuity

In the further development the human craving for perpetuity becomes a substantial support of the family. It, however, undergoes a great change, so that its first expressions are quite different from those known to us. In this respect it is unlike identity, which keeps its essential meaning on all cultural levels. Perpetuity, on the contrary, and the form it takes, reflects the stages of social culture. Its most primitive experiences are clearly not products of the infancy relationship, but, as the meaning of this association grows and the family as an experience responds to its opportunities and enlarges and becomes more stable, the notion that in a simple way reveals the inclination for perpetuity ties up with the domestic organization and strengthens it as it functions in the life of individuals and the culture of the group.

Reaction to death—perhaps a better expression is recoil from the dead—would seem to be the first root of the impulses that lead human feeling and thinking in the direction of a quest for perpetuity. Even here, however, it is evident that family relationships had a significance, for those who are brought closest to the fact of death, even in the simplest societies, are persons who recognize an identity of kinship. It would be unfair to simple folk also not to credit them with affection, generally nursed within the domestic sphere, which makes death have a meaning denied it in the absence of self-consciousness. Nevertheless, it is only when the infancy period has developed to the point where it provides a quantity of experience, a sophisticated

meaning, that perpetuity emerges as an important support of the family.

Looking backward from our own civilization, it is natural to think that the human desire for perpetuity grew out of the protest against the cruelty of death. Natural as this seems to us, there is danger here of reading into very simple experience more than it contains. There is no doubt that peoples living on the primitive levels of culture, as we have come to know them in historic times, fear death, and for the most part, if not always, take for granted a spiritual survival of the deceased. However, the doctrine of spirit survival is so thoroughly intertwined with the experience of death that no provision occurs for recoil from the idea that death represents an end. On the other hand, the grief of primitive peoples at the loss through death of persons close to them in human ties certainly occurs and forbids our saying that the reaction common with us is unknown to those living in a simpler culture.[1] Even though, as with us, there is a convention that directs and undoubtedly exaggerates the grief element, social practice, nevertheless, testifies to an element of feeling. The following example illustrates both genuine emotion and regard to the social convention:

> Around the patient are collected the members of the family, and neighbours and visitors pass in and out unhindered, doing little more than excluding light and air. All are most persistent in addressing the patient, and with endless repetition utter the word "ndo," an expression which conveys a much deeper and more comprehensive meaning than the English word "sympathy." As long as breath remains in the body there is little excitement. Some sit or stand with sorrowful countenances, whilst others move about in a casual manner, seemingly but little affected by the scene. But immediately the patient dies there is a wild outburst of wailing. In the case of a near relative, as a wife for her husband, or a mother for her child, it speedily develops into a form of frenzy. The bereaved woman rushes forth from the death chamber, beating her breast, and runs through the village bewailing her loss at the top of her voice. She

[1] W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior*, pp. 297-298.

salutes none, but continues to cry out even when she has left the town behind her. A woman will thus pass the whole night in the bush pouring out her lamentations, and return next morning in an utterly exhausted condition.[2]

It is unlikely that any one characteristic of primitive reaction to death deserves to be universalized, but unquestionably the most common is that of fear, which appears in the common taboo against contact with the dead body. The native, however, early discovered an antidote through a dualistic philosophy of life in which the dead are reincarnated as spirits. The spirit side of his existence thoroughly rivaled his sensory experiences and became as demanding upon his attention and discipline as conditions required for physical existence.

Perpetuity as a human desire

Once self-consciousness had matured to the point that led man to scrutinize his own experience, death would take on a new meaning and eventually meet with emotional protest. The evidence that this occurred in early religious and philosophic thinking in the historic era leads us to believe that there was a beginning of such reactions even earlier, lost to us because there were no means of transmission other than folklore, which provides no clear, firm pathway backward into the origins of man's efforts to deal with death when it came to mean the ending of the earthly career. From this recoil the desire for perpetuity emerges, taking, as one would expect, various expressions. As a consequence, the motivation of self-preservation was carried so far that it asked for more than human existence in a time-limited destiny could be given. This desire entrenched itself, and survival through perpetuity became a conscious, human motive. This, of course, did not mean that belief in personal immortality became clear and universal and, by possessing the imagination, built into the individual hopes of an eternal

[2] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, pp. 112-113.

life. The quest for perpetuity was more deeply rooted and more catholic in its appeal than the idea of conscious, continuous personal existence. The more basic quest was for some sort of security from the time-controlled characteristics of human experience. It found itself not in these abstract terms but in concrete desires that we rightly interpret as various methods of seeking the greatest degree possible of perpetuity.

This underlying motive provided an opportunity for religion, and the alliance between the two became so close in historic, occidental religious culture as finally to seem one and inseparable. Religious faith not only gave assurance to what had come to be a sound human desire but also made use of it as a means of adjusting the individual to his circumstances. Belief in the immortal life thus became an emotional and social advantage, and the taking of this from the convictions of many modern men and women creates difficulties in meeting the challenge of life, thus revealing how much the individual in times past has profited from his strong faith in survival after death.[3]

Some primitive expressions of perpetuity

One of the first illustrations that we find in primitive life of the working of the idea of perpetuity is in the belief in the reappearance of ancestral spirits. This belief has a complex source, but it emphasizes, nevertheless, the doctrine of a continuous existence. Since it arises from the total background of the native, it cannot be interpreted simply as evidence of survival after death. Moreover, it stresses the objective point of view rather than the subjective. Thus the native is convinced of the existence of those near to him who have died, but this does not seem to well up in his own consciousness as a means of escaping from his own personal destiny of death. He is so apt to think of death as something arbitrarily, willfully brought about, usually through the use of magic, that his desire is to protect himself against such menaces rather than to feel cer-

[3] C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.*

tainty that he will exist after death. As a consequence, his thought of spirit life is associated with the death of others rather than with his own experience. It also would be a misjudging of his feelings to assume that he has created the spirit life because he wishes friends and relatives to come back in some way and continue their one-time association. Fear of these spirits appears too often to permit this interpretation. On the other hand, the opposite dogmatism is also ruled out because the ancestral spirit may be looked upon as the friendly support of the family, or at least as one who can be propitiated and led to take an active interest in the family of which he was formerly a member. This confidence in the helpfulness of ancestral spirits appears in the following statement of Leonard:

> In any case it is extremely doubtful that, if left to the family (as it would be in this instance), the family would select a human reincarnation in preference to spiritual mediation. For as the spiritual life undoubtedly holds or occupies a stronger, therefore a superior position, it is more likely that the spirit control would be held in greater esteem, as being of more value to the house than when reincarnated in the entity of some living member of the family, unless it so happened that the returned spirit-soul is reincarnated in the son or elected successor. But this, besides being a most unlikely contingency in itself, is, when all the personal issues are taken into consideration, a most improbable if not impracticable event. It is possible, of course, even after death for the spirit of the ego to communicate with members of his household through the very common and convenient medium of a dream. Indeed it is obviously probable that, thinking over such matters as deeply as these natives do, the wish in such an instance is often thus conveyed. But even in a case of this kind the more powerful the personality the more likely is it that the choice will alight on the spiritual.
>
> For the masterful ego, especially if he has occupied the position of head of the house, is practically bound to return and remain in the self-selected family symbol as mediator—all the more so if he has been self-made and the maker of his own house—because veneration paid to the spirit of the departed is the greatest honour that

the human ego can attain to; therefore the greater the personality the greater the honour, amounting, as it may do, to deification.[4]

Always in the background of this belief in ancestral spirits is this conviction of sorcery which carries the atmosphere of perpetuity. Its evil power is a "perpetual possibility." [5]

Reincarnation also reveals the notion of perpetuity in a different form. How closely this and ancestral spirit worship are associated appears in such an instance as that recorded by Malinowski in his portrayal of Trobriand tradition. Among these people the idea is held that when the spirit wearies of his constant rejuvenation during a long existence "underneath," he chooses to come back to earth again and appears in the life of an infant, taking possession before birth.[6]

Another and more mature illustration of the development of perpetuity appears in emphasis upon the ancestral line. This may move backward so as to enforce family descent, maturing in the worship of patriarchs, or forward, stressing the significance of the heir. In either case the tendency is to build a concept of a timeless family. This, as it is expressed in historic time, makes fertility and particularly the rearing of male children, because of masculine dominance in the culture, something so important that it becomes the wife's chief domestic obligation. The woman who cannot deliver a son to carry on the family line is burdened with a sense of guilt, which she usually accepts as justified, and is either cast out or replaced by another wife or permitted to transfer the responsibility to a concubine. As an example of this we have Sarah, from fear of having no children, giving Abram her maid, Hagar, that the latter might bring forth the child that the wife could not.[7] Again we find Rachel, wife of Jacob, compensating in the same way for her failure as a wife.[8] This practice brought the

[4] A. G. Leonard, *The Lower Niger and Its Tribes*, p. 209.
[5] Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality*, p. 63.
[6] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, p. 171.
[7] Genesis 16:1-16.
[8] *Ibid.*, 30:3-9.

concubine into the Hebrew family, since her children were recorded in the line of family descent.

Perpetuity and family experience

With the development of a sensitive and analytic self-consciousness, the desire for perpetuity draws strength from the common protest against the changing character of human experience. The time limitations, ever present in the careers of men and women, forbid the emotional anchorage that it is human to desire. For many there can be no feeling of security unless in spite of the ongoing, ever changing stream of experience there is conviction of a relationship that is basically continuous. Inspection discloses that even this association in its actual conditions responds to the influence of time and cannot remain stationary. Nevertheless, the core of the relationship, the feeling of possession and being possessed, abides and establishes a perpetuity in the midst of an experience of flux.

Modern life, as is generally recognized, has greatly intensified the recoil from ever changing circumstances. Transitoriness has come to seem one of the essential features of our Western civilization and a characteristic increasingly entering Eastern cultures. As a consequence, the quest for perpetuity is becoming more conscious than ever. It is sought with an emotional aggressiveness outside as well as within our personal relationships. Our largest sense of an unchanging commitment, nevertheless, comes through personal relationship as expressed in domestic life. The modern family attempts to function in providing perpetuity in a way that we rarely expect of other institutions. Religion also, for many men and women, assumes the same task but usually by slicing away from life a territory that is looked upon as different from the rest of experience. On the contrary, the perpetuity given by the family establishes itself in the midst of transitory, everyday happenings. It, therefore, furnishes in life an unrivaled feeling of security. It is not a perfectly satisfying perpetuity, since in its expressions it is

coerced by time, but it provides an emotional refuge, for in its meanings and its loyalties it comes nearest to being the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

Society's use of family perpetuity

Society, as well as the individual, has a stake in the building of family perpetuity. The security of the group requires some line of relationship that helps to establish a feeling of responsibility. The importance of this service of the domestic institution always appears whenever there is an analysis of the contribution of the family to the culture of any particular group of people. The family, more than any other organization, is assigned the role of mediator between impulsive individualism and social welfare. It provides the means of relating the individual, of giving him an unescapable connection with others which by its mere presence forbids that he stand strictly by himself, void of social relationships. Only by being anonymous, severed from his natural connections, can the person, even if he so desires, maintain himself in emotional isolation and individualism. Society takes over the perpetuity provided by family descent and makes constant use of it as a means of locating and distinguishing the individual and of putting upon him his social obligations. American tradition has thus far resisted the registration of the individual with the precision characteristic of many other cultures. Nevertheless, emphasis is placed upon family relationships constantly and in various ways, ranging from the local attitude taken toward the individual on account of his family position to the recognition of family interrelations in all sorts of legal principles and regulations.

Progress in eugenics, better understanding of the ways in which the laws of human heredity work, will enhance family perpetuity and lead to further restrictions on the individual and to a still larger use of family records and backgrounds for the social control of the individual. Social practices are already indicted by scientists because they are expressions of a pre-science

tradition that attempts to deal with human conduct as something flowing from an individual rather than from a person who has had driven into the substance of his being influences of heredity and familial environment.

American culture has not been backward in finding family connections incentives for ambition. Especially has this been true in the field of education. Parents have sought better life-preparation for their children and have found vicarious pride in the successes of their offspring. This has been so strong a motive in American culture that it has brought liabilities as well as assets, malpractices in the home as well as wholesome stimulation.

Family perpetuity and property

Although some serious students of animals have credited them with the possessing of property, this belief has rested upon a false analogy, a reading into their instinctive behavior of motives that do not exist in the absence of self-consciousness. The great distance between such phenomena as the mechanistic hiding of nuts by the squirrel and the child's awakening to the idea of his personal belongings, as his awareness of self develops, shows how dependent the idea of property is upon the achievement of the sort of social interaction monopolized by man. The quality of social consciousness that has expression within the familial association is prerequisite to any growth of the notion of property.

The simple beginnings of property rights may be found in primitive groups, taking shape within the existing folkways. In this development, as one would expect, the family plays a large role, the household serving as the most elemental social organization for the awakening of the feeling of ownership. The tribal regulations limit, extend, and adjust these familial attitudes that lead to the establishment of property rights. Although in their household grouping common interests dominate and each person accepts the division of labor and the distribu-

tion of its products according to custom, there exists within such an association the basis for later growth of the notion of individual possession. A particular weapon or tool, because of its origin, would have greater meaning for him who found or fashioned it than for the other members of the family. That this sentiment of special significance exists is shown by the common practice among primitive peoples of burying with the dead utensils intimately associated with them, which it is assumed they will continue to need in their new existence. Although there may have been a general use of such material by others, since it has served as a common possession of the household, with death appears a recognition that because of its history it has a special relationship with a certain individual.

It is the family as a social unit that provides the interactions that furnish the source of the idea of property as the right of possession. In spite of its sharing resources with other family groups—wealth ranging from hunting grounds to religious privileges—there is generally an assignment to it of belongings, supported by traditions and ceremonial rites, which it holds with an unquestioned exclusiveness. In these within-the-family and outside-the-family beginnings of ownership we find the elemental trends toward private and public ownership.

As soon as there is any firm grasping of the idea of private property, this becomes a social institution with which goes regulation of the transmission of such belongings of the dead as go to the living. This establishment of the right of inheritance is incorporated within the existing folkways. Much that by the modern mind would be regarded as personal possessions remains family, clan, or tribal property. The membership of the group is constantly changing because of the death of individual members, but the ownership of property is continuous and undisturbed.

Once the right of private property is socially recognized, it furnishes another line along which the desire for perpetuity may proceed. The family as an association of particular individuals is subjected to the same tyranny of time and death as

is each person, but its wealth may pass on as something independent of these temporal limitations and become itself a continuation of an ambition that is tied to the family as a social unit. About such property-perpetuity gather, as the idea of inheritance matures, emotions that elevate it to a conscious family purpose and one that easily directs pride and ambition.

This extension of self through property explains in part the importance of a male heir as the necessary means, in societies emphasizing masculine dominance, of securing property-perpetuity. This motive for continuing the family line does not, of course, exhaust the motives for the male heir, but it does commonly reveal how strong in historic society has been the desire for family perpetuity and the opening which property offers for its expression.

Modern life demonstrates in a multitude of ways how forceful this property ambition of a family may be whenever circumstances provide opportunity for its appearance. It influences courtship conditions and mating selection. We have many examples of this in colonial America in legislation designed to give the parents—that is, fathers—control over the courtship of their daughters. The New Haven colony passed this regulation:

> . . . that whosoever within this jurisdiction shall attempt, or endeavor to inveagle, or draw the affections of any maide, or maide-servant, whether daughter, kinswoman, or in other relation, for himself, or for any other person, without the consent of father, master, governor, or such other, who hath the present interest, or charge, or (in absence of such) of the nearest magistrate, whether it be by speech, writing, message, company-keeping, unnecessary familiarity, disorderly night meetings, sinful dalliance, gifts, or any other way, directly or indirectly, every such person (besides all damages which the parent, governor, or person intrusted or interested, may sustain by such unlawful proceedings) shall pay to the plantation forty shillings for the first offence; and for the second offence towards the same part four pounds; and for the third offence he shall be further fined, imprisoned, or corporally punished,

as the plantation court, or court of magistrates considering all circumstances, shall determine.[9]

Property-perpetuity frequently furnishes the momentum for a quantity of business, professional, and political ambition that may, in the effort to achieve a success that it is assumed will perpetuate the family, go even so far as to weaken present domestic interests and fellowship. An interesting example of this is the English phrase "establish a family" as a synonym for creating an estate.

The cruel significance of sterility, previously discussed, is explained in part by the folkway's emphasis on the need of means of carrying on the family and its property. Social prestige is involved also, but as soon as property rights appear they strengthen this earlier motive. The failure to bear a male child, since inheritance follows the masculine line of descent, is only slightly removed from absolute barrenness in the reaction it receives. Sterility is one of the most frequent grounds for divorcing a wife. Sometimes, once a child is born, usually a son, no divorce is permitted. In many cases these so-called divorces for sterility are really proof-marriages.[10] Not until a child is born, and this may mean a boy, is the marriage considered final.

Property-perpetuity may be enlarged so as to become the desire to continue fame and power as well as economic standing by means of family succession. Napoleon's divorce of Josephine is the illustration of this that is most likely to occur to the reader. In this case, an ambition that had to go beyond personal success was able to smother sex attraction and affection. The great Emperor disclosed his determination to establish a family perpetuity in his unwise efforts to distribute his conquests to his brothers and sisters. Charged, as he commonly is, with self-

[9] *New Haven Colonial Record,* II, 600; J. H. Trumbull, *The True Blue Laws of New Haven and the False Blue Laws Forged by Peters* (Hartford, 1876).

[10] G. E. Howard, *A History of Matrimonial Institutions,* vol. I, p. 234.

ishness, it would be more correct to indict Napoleon with a ruthless, insatiable family ambition in which the craving for perpetuity had the largest place. He did not merely seek, as the Hebrew patriarch, the ongoing of his family; he struggled hopelessly to perpetuate his genius and his power.

Family perpetuity and immortality

Not only has the family been the chief source of the desire for a perpetuity that has reached its full expression in the human hope of immortality, but, historically, family life has also been the predecessor of the notion of an eternal life. The evolution of the religion of the Hebrews is an interesting example of this anticipation in family perpetuity of the doctrine of immortality. There was a looking forward rather than backward, expressed as in the covenant recorded between Jehovah and Abraham:

> That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.[11]

This idea of immortality through the ongoing of the family was the original Hebrew solution of the problem of life after death. Along with it developed mourning customs and various practices associated with ancestor-cults which the prophets condemned. Imported influences, probably first from Egypt, and the maturing of religious consciousness led away from the family immortality to the idea of the existence of the individual after death.

We have in the history of religious development pictures of paradise[12] as the ongoing of ancestors who are larger, abler,

[11] Genesis 22:17-18.

[12] F. W. Hopkins, *Origin and Evolution of Religion*, p. 231.

and live longer than when on earth. They approach the gods in their superior attainments after death.

This association of the family and religious belief shows not only how easily family perpetuity moves into the doctrine of immortality but also the intimacy between the home and religious ideas. The priestly function of the father as head of the family is another example of this connection. As a result we find in the evolution of religion expressions of rivalry between family worship and a more socialized group type of religion. The domestic rites had to give way as the authority of religion became more centralized. China is an example of a successful resistance to this change, a persisting of a family type of religion with Heaven and Earth as the great universal parents and the Emperor as their heir and representative among men.[13] Ancestor worship is the basis of religious faith, and immortality is the spirit life of family members who have died but who continue to exercise an influence over the living. This conception of religion spread its influence into both Korea and Japan. In this oriental holding to the family type of religion we now find our clearest expression of the desire for family perpetuity showing itself in the idea of the future life.

The contribution of sex to family perpetuity

The seasonable expression of sex that we find among the higher animals appears on the human level only in so far as the rhythmical ebb and flow of sexual impulse becomes apparent during the monthly cycle. This variability in different degrees is especially characteristic of woman's responsiveness to sexual opportunity. During the long evolutionary period that bridges animal and human life, sex desire attained a greater continuity and this favored a less interrupted and more durable association between the male and female, which in turn acted upon sex itself. Each change, when it occurred, tended still more to affect the others, so that the man and woman developed greater

[13] George W. Cooke, *The Social Evolution of Religion,* pp. 195-196.

continuity of sexual interest one for the other along with a qualitative growth in sexual attraction.

Joined with these changes were economic and defensive motives that contributed to the living together of the man and woman. These combinations of influences tending toward the perpetuating of the husband-wife relationship became the allies of the incentives brought forth by the parent-child relationship, expressing first mother love and later parent love. Although the others were not firmly established as an instinct, as were the ties of mother and offspring, they were incorporated with the incentives that the lengthening of the infancy period provided.

If sex had been continued among humans as a periodic breaking out of strong impulse, as characteristically appears in the rutting season of the higher animals, it would have been an eruptive influence antagonizing the development of the perpetuity so necessary in the establishment of the kind of family association needed to provide the continuing nurture and protection demanded by the human infant. Under such circumstances, the domestic development would have proceeded along the line of mother love, with sex attraction maintaining its independence. Even so, it is conceivable that family life of a sort would of necessity have been established, but the growth of family ties and the enrichment of sex desire could only have proceeded as separate evolutions. The difficulty that society has always had in keeping sex relationships within the family, especially in the case of the male, gives some idea what a limitation family life supported only by the extension of mother love and economic advantage must have encountered.

A more continuous sex relationship, including a measure of changeableness, especially in the woman in the willingness to accept sex intercourse, also tended to make the sexual relationship of the man and woman who had chosen association together more self-conscious and substantial. The relationship not only gained duration, but during the period of living together there were experiences of inhibition through the lessening or fading away of sex desire and a greater emphasis at such times of other

common interests between the man and the woman. This, it would seem, must have led man, who was much less changeable in his impulse, to attempt to win the woman in a radically different way from those by which the male animal struggles to become the favored suitor for the female's response. It could not be merely rivalry between male and male but must be an effort to make the female responsive. The sexual embrace, less an instinct and more a mutual and conscious need of the other, became co-operative in a new sense, opening up new territory for the expansion of the psychic qualities that have now become so large a part of human sex relationships.

The same tendency was inherent in the lengthening of the infancy period. The mere keeping together of mother and offspring during a longer time with a constantly increasing meaning in the association led to an enrichment and not a mere continuation. Perpetuity added quality to family association as a result of the slower development of the infant and the greater quantity and variety of the intimacies expressed in the mother-child contact. The greater continuity in the husband-wife fellowship must have contributed to the strengthening of the ties between father and child. Mere propinquity of the two would tend toward a greater sense of belonging together.

We know that the savage likes to tame wild animals, when possible, and that there exists between him and his pets a considerable companionship.[14] The child was certainly no less inviting to such impulses than the monkey or dog, provided the father and child were kept in association long enough for the capacities of playful response to attention to appear in the latter. Whatever influences tended to keep the father and mother in longer association encouraged the building of a parental love in which both the man and woman shared. This in time would add to the influences holding them together and also provide a richer emotional fellowship, stimulating the responsiveness of the child to the parent's attention.

[14] F. Ratzel, *History of Mankind*, vol. 1, p. 39.

Domestic perpetuity through fixation

The emotional meaning that domestic experience has acquired becomes a potential risk to both parent and child. The incentives in the child that lead to resistance to change in the attempt to hold stationary the pleasure-bringing status of dependency are inherent and only enhanced by modern life in the degree that parental policy encourages the natural reluctance of the child to move forward. One of the earliest and most easily recognized expressions of this disposition is in the child's recoil from weaning. It is best seen in cases in which the mother nurses the child, but may appear when the bottle of prepared food is withheld and the child is forced to eat food more mature in form. It is not uncommon to find the child continuing to play with the bottle even though he is permitted to use it only for the drinking of water.

This weaning experience is but one spectacular illustration of a rather constant struggle on the part of the child to hold to each stage of home conditions, once they have become familiar and pleasant, as long as possible. Meanwhile the parent is tempted to a dualistic attitude, both wishing his child to grow up that he may be less trouble and at the same time seeking to maintain the status quo because of the emotional satisfactions it brings the adult. Obviously it is easy for the balance to be tipped so that the parent uses his opportunities to retard, and sometimes emotionally to abort, the development that normally should take place.

Excessive encouragement by the parent of the child's eagerness to cling to accustomed ways and well-established relationships may bring fixation in a double sense. There is a relative stopping of the growth processes. This retardation can never be complete in the case of a normal child because of pressure of circumstances, provided there is no mental deficiency forbidding change and advance. Emotions, however, are freer to hold back than are the activities and thinking of the child. One result of this may be an emotional antagonism to the necessary progress

that takes place, even going far enough to establish in the child a dualistic attitude toward life so that he is forced to struggle with two worlds—one that is self-created, in which the emotions are largely stationary, and the other in which a degree of change takes place from which he cannot escape on account of the exigencies of his physical and social experience.

There is also in cases of emotional retardation a fixation in the more usual psychiatric sense. The child parasitically ties himself to the parent through his dependency, and the adult through lack of self-restraint and emotional maturity accepts, even welcomes, the perpetuity of the parent-child relationship that belonged seasonably to the earliest period of childhood. This fixation is not merely an unwise attachment, it is also a perverted development. The child cannot grow up emotionally and is left with an immature personality. If the original fixation is broken, the childish character seeks again to find in some other individual the support that will permit him to indulge his dependency.

The parental policy may be carried to such an extreme that a continuing dependency of the child becomes the test of affection. This brings to the offspring the supreme contest, a struggle between self-development and self-security, which in the earlier years must be based upon confident love. Even when the parental program does not go so far, the child is still left with the possibility of conflict as he seeks both to escape from a relationship that, however attractive, is also coercive to many of his impulses, and to hold to the dependency that has become so captivating. Whatever development takes place may appear to be at the expense of relationship so that he is constantly forced to carry through a repudiation of a love-status that has become his emotional ideal.

Using the child for parental perpetuity

There is another mishap that can occur in domestic relationship that reveals again the dangers associated with family

perpetuity. The parent may seek through the child the opportunity to carry on his own career. This is a parasitic attempt, but reverses the conditions of fixation. The parent seeks to live through the child and to attain satisfactions by making the latter subservient to himself. This exploitation may take many forms. One of the commonest is for the parent to use the child as a means of fulfilling his own ambitions. All of the native inclinations of the child may be ignored, and from the first he may be forced onward to a career which is what the parent wishes he had achieved or what the parent is determined because of his own success to perpetuate. Again the success of the parent means the weakening of the child's integrity. Unless the latter can find a way of escape, as he sometimes does relatively late in life, he must carry on in a conflict that will be the more intense, the stronger he feels the urge to an independent vocation, or the richer his endowment which prepares him for some other sort of life-career. His freedom may have to come by his breaking away from the love ties that bind him to his parent.

Another form of this injurious seeking of perpetuity appears when the parent projects his own life into that of the child so that he uses the latter as a means of getting relief from his own emotional burden or as a substitute for his own emotional limitations or blocking. Affection may be used to make the child eager to fulfill parental expectation without his becoming aware that he is being used parasitically as an instrument for the fulfilling of the parent's desires.

Domestic perpetuity through the growth of the child

The potential hazards of domestic perpetuity may by a proper family program be denied expression. If the parent's interest is in the child's growth, if his satisfactions are obtained not through a stationary but a progressive relationship, both types of parasitic perpetuity are prevented. The difference is merely one of attitude, but the consequences are immense. It is fortunate that there are many influences that help make the parent

willing to have his child grow up. The social environment tends toward the emotional health of the parent and child in something like the way in which the body organizes itself to resist disease and maintain vitality. The social influences are of course not so consistent because they are not so automatic as is the functioning of the human organism. This explains the emphasis that has been placed recently by psychiatric science on the hazards of parenthood, especially motherhood.

Modern conditions of life are doubtless conducive to the emotional perversions that make family perpetuity a liability rather than an asset. Because of this there is need, as suggested in the last chapter, of some means by which the quality of parenthood as it affects the child may be determined and revealed to the offending father or mother. Domestic perpetuity is a social essential, but it needs to be safeguarded lest it become a prey to the unthinking, well-meaning, but injury-causing parent.

Family perpetuity and environmental instability

Domestic perpetuity can be weakened by the environmental circumstances in which the family finds itself. An illustration of this, which has great meaning for urban families, is frequent moving. City inhabitants, nearly always renters, move freely and for various reasons. This constant yanking of the family out of one environment and placing it in another weakens the feeling of perpetuity, especially in the case of the child. The latter cannot keep separate his experiences within the family and those from the outside, but the two mingle together and to some extent each influences the other. The child who is moved from place to place is repeatedly obliged to struggle to establish himself, and by the time he approaches environmental equilibrium he is thrown into a new situation where again he must undertake the task of finding a place, even though the family itself remains impervious to the changing environmental conditions. There are so many breaks in his experience taken as a whole that the security of a steady development of perpetuity

is denied him. He may retreat from the environment into the home and again attempt a dualistic career, gathering his satisfactions almost exclusively in his family relationships and finding his frustrations for the most part outside the home. More commonly, at least so one gathers from the case histories of urban delinquency, the child loses the sense of perpetuity, becomes precociously restless, adventurous, and even antisocial. If the environmental changes bring conflicts due to differences of cultural class, the dangers of his situation are greatly increased.

Studies of the mobility of urban people reveal that this moving about is frequent enough to make it for many families an attack upon domestic perpetuity, at least from the viewpoint of the child. In Middletown, the Lynds found that more than half of the working class families which they interviewed had moved in a three and a half year period, and about a fourth of them had moved twice in that same length of time.[15] In a group studied in Newark, New Jersey, it was found that 68 per cent of the families had moved within five years.[16] This moving is of course not confined to the city since we find it in industrial towns and also in rural districts—in the last instance, especially among tenant farmers. Frequent moving is always a threat against the feeling of family perpetuity, but the difficulties of adjustment to the new environment are likely to be greater in the city than on the farm or even in the village. The farm family is so much more self-contained that moving brings it much less disturbance. The families of migratory workers, such as pickers of fruits and vegetables who follow the seasons, moving from one locality to another, and trailer families are, so far as building perpetuity is concerned, most unfortunate in their environmental situation.

The rapid changing of the cultural environment in modern life has a similar effect upon the perpetuity of the family, affecting the adults possibly more than the children, because the former are more exposed. It is at this point that we find some of the

[15] R. S. and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown*, p. 520.
[16] James S. Plant, *Personality and the Cultural Pattern*, p. 106.

explanation of the instability of the contemporary home. The qualitative change of environment is not so clear as the spatial change, but its results are not less because they are more concealed. As is stated elsewhere, it is not merely that the family is called upon from time to time to readjust itself to new conditions. As a matter of fact, many of the most substantial changes affect the thinking and feeling of the inmates of the home rather than the home itself in any direct fashion. It is therefore the feeling of insecurity, the inability of the emotional life to gain a trustworthy support, that makes the trouble. Standards, ideals, hopes, come to seem as transitory as habits of life. The home may provide an antidote for this, and it would seem that here it has opportunity for an increasing function. But on the other hand, feelings of frustration and futility can be driven into the personality by environmental change and carried into family relationships so that on account of the effect the rapid-moving cultural environment has had upon the personalities that make up the individual homes, through the weakening of the sense of domestic perpetuity, family instability follows.

VI. *The Incentive of Transcendency and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY. Both the problem and the process of building society appear on levels of life lower than the human. One of the first innovations that gave evidence of the advantage of social organization as a means of survival, especially in its promise of a higher quality of biologic experience, was the union of the offspring of parent cells forming aggregates. These multicellular organisms gave rise to a new order of life by bringing independent cells into a working unit. For still greater advancement it was necessary that a more complex organism should develop, providing unity for many cells having specific and differing functions. The co-operation characteristic of this more complicated type of organism rested upon a structural basis.

For the achievement of the highest possible quality of life a still more complex union was necessary, one that permitted individuals to exist while at the same time making possible a co-operative economy through the assignment of different functions among these rather than by the structural peculiarities characteristic of lower-type cohesions. This required the organizing of a society, with its still more complex form, and this has found its supreme expression in human conduct. A firmer type of social organization appears in the case of the ants, for example, but at the expense of loss in the range of the experience permitted the individual. Thus the problem resulting from the distinction of society on the human level is the adjustment of impulses of individualism on the one side with the needs of social co-operation on the other.

History shows periodic emphasis of one at the expense of the other, but always human impulses strive, in the effort to gain satisfactory survival, for a compromise of the two possible extremes, the working out of a social organization that awards a large place to individual independence and responsibility. Self-consciousness provides incentive for self-feelings that need, for the satisfaction of the individual, freedom from the coercion of an automatic, structurally imposed cohesion. Society, to establish on the human level a way of life that can use and that does not attack human impulses, must preserve individuality while at the same time giving it direction and discipline. This bringing of two opposite human needs into harmony constitutes the ever present problem of society. Intimations of it appear in the behavior of the higher animals.

The process that makes possible this construction of social life is not simple and cannot be delegated to any one institution. No division of society, however, has a larger function in making this adjustment than the family. It chiefly takes over the responsibility of curbing the individual in the ways necessary to prepare for a successful entrance into the larger co-operative enterprise, society, as expressed in the concrete milieu that makes up the particular culture of the group into which the person has happened to fall.

Looking over the process from a long range, it is clear that it is pain-pleasure pressure that forces the limitation of the individual necessary for the maintenance of some form of social organization. The individual is forced beyond himself, since only through co-operation with others can he have any large measure of security or satisfaction. When this process of limiting and co-ordinating individualistic and social values is looked at, as it goes on in the life of each member of the existing society, the significance of the family as the agency for forcing this difficult adjustment becomes clear. The parent who embodies in himself some degree of social co-operation takes over the task of leading the child early, in his first self-expressions, toward a recognition of the needs beyond his own attainment that

require the working together of others who, like himself, also feel deeply individualistic impulses. The self has to be carried beyond itself in order that the qualities of its life may survive. This is a transcendency indispensable in the building of all human social organizations.

More than family co-operation

The family no more than any other social organization can exist in an association of persons absolutely individualistic. Its continuing operation requires adjustment. In large measure this means putting aside personal inclinations and curbing self-seeking in order that there may be a successful living together with others who share a domestic identity. The family, however, even in bringing this about, does more than merely provide its own security. It leads each member beyond himself and gives him an insight, a reaction, and a responsibility that exceeds what would come from self-limited inclination. In this the family not only trains the young child to enter later in a self-conscious way into the life of the group as a whole but equally influences the adult to carry his share of the load in the greater undertaking of the out-of-the-family social activities. As a consequence, the individual is carried not only beyond himself but beyond his familial experience as he joins with others to maintain group co-operation.

If, as has often been insisted, he is motivated in his alliance with others by the instinct of self-preservation, this impulse is so widened as to give it new meaning. It includes the effort to conserve interests that cannot be had in isolation, possessions that are not only beyond his own body, his own activities, but even beyond the reaches of his sentiments toward his own offspring. It does not belittle this process to think of it as a compulsion to social co-operation.[1] The main thing is that the egoistic concentration is desired because of necessities that come forth from the person's own contact with nature and with his

[1] William Patten, *The Grand Strategy of Evolution*, p. 273.

fellows. The individual is driven out of himself into some sort of social functioning because only so can he make any measurable approach toward the things and the relationships that he seeks for his own fulfillment. Just as he has to be more than a mere biologic individual, he also has to become something other than a loyal member of a domestic group. The family has a large part in creating these needs that require a greater social organization. If in any degree they are to be attained beyond what is provided by the household itself, there has to be a larger-sized co-operation—a society.

Society, however, must not be thought of as something that waited for the full maturing of the family before it began to take the form characteristic of human experience. On the contrary, the individual, the family, and society grew up together, the advance of one forcing the development of the other. Nevertheless, the family acted as the training place or, better, the tutor of human nature, as the individual was both led and driven toward the greater-than-family social organization. The family was never an end in itself. Just as the individual expanded the meaning of his life through the intricacies of self-consciousness, not in isolation but through contact, and particularly in his association with others of a common identity, so the meaning of stability of the family grew by its increasing social functioning.

This socializing process cannot be conceived of as either foreign to human nature or as going on without changing human characteristics. There had to be a growth, but this was not secured by bringing into human nature what it did not possess but by extending it. It was a transcendency beyond the family into a field of inexhaustible complexities of relationships. It was a product of development rather than of accretion.

A continuous social process

Society persists in the same way that it originated. We do not become members of the social group, sharers of the prevailing culture, by entering into society as one joins a business or

becomes by legislative decree a citizen or is given the privileges of a club or a fraternal organization. There has to be in the individual career a working of the same process which extended the self-life beyond individualism, beyond family interests, into the greater interactions of group contact. Society lives by carrying on this same process that brought it into being, and has assigned to the family the same large task of building from the substances of individualistic desires and impulses both the inclinations and the resources for social cohesion and co-operation.

The family offers the strategic service in this training process and one that is indispensable. This responsibility need not be performed by an organization similar to our modern domestic concentration of relationship, but if not, the agency that carries on must assume the same function and, so far as this part of its activities is concerned, becomes merely a different kind of family.

The family contribution to society

Society is not a mere enlargement of the herd. Without discounting the value of gregariousness as an influence for holding individuals together, the coming of society required the development of interactions that could only grow out of a more precise feeling of relationship than anything associated with the instinct that leads animals to cluster together. The family also did not become a society by mere growth of numbers. Social life in the self-conscious sense demanded an outlook broader than any that could come from a feeling of identity limited to the family circle. Social relationships had to exist in their own right, even though a considerable part of the training necessary to recognize these grew out of the relationship of parent and child.

Since we cannot recover the earliest stages of the building of human society, we have to look to the facts that we now know for our ideas as to what happened as society began to emerge. It seems reasonable to assume that what is now true was even more characteristic of that earlier period. It is only in rare

moments that the average person is to any extent made conscious of the expediency of social organization in our own time. There may be a general, long-established conviction that various forms of social organization are necessary, ranging from the neighborhood to international types, but for the most part the average citizen takes part in group activities as a matter of course, without thinking of their intricacies or their value. In emergencies, through agitation and by education purposefully directed, he may be made aware of the need of social organization and the advantages and disadvantages of any prevailing social situation. In view of this fact it seems reasonable to think of society as a specific experience coming more and more as man's career went forward. Thus social experience would not await a definite degree of human maturity but in frail form would appear with man's first distinctive break from the animal career. This would mean that man from the beginning advanced on three fronts in the growth of his culture: as a person, as he took on the characteristics of the individual; as a member of the family, as he achieved new experiences in domestic relations; and as a member of society, as with increasing intelligence he learned to work with others for greater security and larger satisfactions.

The other-than-self motives

As man's progress went on in three related directions, it was necessary for such an evolution that the individual respond to motives that transcended himself. The principle of other-than-self not only needed to operate but also to become self-conscious. This is now true even in the development of individuality, although its working is not so near the surface as in the case of family and social experience. The individual becomes aware of himself, gains insight into the meaning of his own emotional reactions through motivations that carry him beyond his own self-interests. The principle of other-than-self is so fundamental to the mere existence of the family and society that its expression in these fields is axiomatic. To be sure, man does not under

ordinary circumstances act from an abstract principle but is taught by responding to concrete situations in such a way that, although specific desires become self-conscious, the notion of observing other than self-interest usually remains hidden. Analysis uncovers the deeper significance of practices that are taken as a matter of course. It is necessary to do some searching into human motivations along this line in order to get an additional understanding of the significance of the lengthening of the infancy period. If human experience, as we now have it, can be trusted to show principles of behavior that have always been characteristically human, we find the principle of other-than-self revealing itself along two different lines.

The first has a structural basis. Sex hunger creates the need of another, demands a degree of co-operation that at the same time emphasizes difference. As a consequence, sex adjustment is an achievement of oneness that has to recognize distinctions. Out of this comes the possibility of sexual antagonism making the adjustment of two unlike individuals, however successful for the moment, a truce in intermittent conflict. It was this oneness with distinctions that led Plato to the doctrine that the man and the woman represented each something uncompleted and that their union was a fusion of unlikeness. In any case, sex attraction means that interest is directed toward another person who, although different, is desired as a means of self-fulfillment. In our sophisticated period, when all of these fundamental motivations, as they appear in self-consciousness, are heavily conditioned by social influences, we have personalities that emphasize the other and personalities that emphasize the self, but however radically different in their philosophies of love, both reveal the principle of other-than-self.

Mother love and the principle of other-than-self

It is in mother love that we find a consistent appearance of the principle of other-than-self. Sex attraction demands another, but not necessarily with regard for the other's interest. The

individual of opposite biologic structure may be merely the necessary means of a thoroughly personal satisfaction. Although sex means that there must be attention to others by going out from one's own self, it does not follow that this is a passage out of selfhood, a transcendency. Instead, it may be the attempt to drag another into the self-life and may represent exploitation rather than co-operation, although for purposes of adjustment some measure of the latter has to be included.

In contrast, mother love gives, in average experience, an incentive that does carry the individual out of herself, thus making possible genuine transcendency. In our time this momentum has to be described as parent love rather than mother love, but the mother attachment is the one that opens up the meaning of the infancy period as the means of developing, deepening, and extending the principle of other-than-self, a forceful, impulsive, and persisting transcendency. In the animal we find it on the higher levels, instinctive and temporary; in human experience, self-conscious and lasting.

This transference of regard is so interwoven with the infant-parent relationship that even among the higher animals it seems the essential feature of the association. When it disappears the infancy period comes to an end. While it continues the mother-offspring feeling dominates, as a rule, the survival interest of the individual animal even to the point of sacrifice of life.

This elemental parent-offspring reaction, the chief characteristic of the infancy period, provides that which is indispensable to social organization, the impulse that leads to the individual going out of himself. This he needs to do even for any form of co-operative alliance. If he is to enjoy stable social organization he must, in association with others, get the habit of doing that for which the mother has such overwhelming desire. Society is not born from a vision of its expediency. It is not in its largest significance a covenant according to the idea of the eighteenth century philosopher.[2] On the contrary, the social

[2] Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan.*

disposition precedes any agreement, and although social organization is a necessity for survival in its human qualitative meaning, the incitement for it, as animal conduct reveals, is not a utilitarian recognition of self-interest but of impulses that are instinctive. Nature had too much at stake for any other anchorage of the motivation that insures the mother's nurturing the offspring. Human evolution is an extension of this essential characteristic of the infancy period as found in animal life.

The mother-child relationship becomes the flow of social incentives in that it fashions the disposition which enables the individual to transcend himself. It is not too much to say that the mother-child relationship constitutes the original self-conscious society; indeed, even the mother by herself constitutes a potential society.[3] This assertion gives a false picture of the construction of social life merely because it is too simple a statement to uncover the threefold maturing processes, identity, perpetuity, transcendency, that enhanced the individual, family, and society simultaneously. All three are contained in the normal parent-child relationship, but there is the temptation to interpret narrowly parent-child interactions and to think of the process as moving in only one direction. Since attention to persons gives the fundamental set to social actions and to social thinking, the parent-offspring relationship, even among the higher animals, had as its core the principle of other-than-self, the very thing indispensable to the construction of social organization.

In our own time we find this carried forward as a socializing influence in the fact that the most concentrated mother is forced beyond her personal interest in her child and made to have regard for environmental circumstances and the attitudes and interests of others, because only so can she protect her child. If her first transference from self-regard is impulsive, according to some psychologists something instinctive, it leads her, nevertheless, onward to a consideration of others, even though her purpose be utter self-interest through her child. Society has to have for its existence motivations that bring transcendency beyond the

[3] Siegfried Bernfeld, *The Psychology of the Infant*, pp. 57-58.

individual. The urges that bring this about may not be unselfish or even just, however advantageous the more ethical point of view in the maintenance of a social organization. The imperative condition is that there be a going beyond oneself so that there is recognition of relationship. This impulse is both the most elemental and the strongest force parent-offspring relationship provides. We find it present in the animal, limited, however, by lack of intelligence and by absence of a memory that can carry practices forward from generation to generation until culture accumulates and has a measure of humanness. The animal in the higher ranges of its mother-offspring relationship provides a revealing example of the forcefulness of its crude type of transcendency, but the fashioning of this into social incentives through the maturing and deepening of the emotions connected with the mother-child relationship, allied with an increasing intelligence, permitting both individualism and social organization, is found only between the human mother and her infant.

Mother love is not an inevitable result of motherhood. Even among animals,[4] especially when they are domesticated, we find exceptions in the instinctive care of offspring. A cat in the author's household, for example, had kittens several times, refusing always to nurse them. The normal, in the sense of the usual, effect of motherhood among humans is to bring forth in various degrees a regard for the child that naturally expresses itself in an out-of-the-self commitment. Had this not been true as a rule, human evolution would soon have come to an end, for the infant's helplessness required in the mother a dependable attachment.

The mother is to the child the complete fulfillment of need. Even the satisfaction of hunger she provides. The child at the mother's breast constitutes the most intimate interdependency normally possible between two human beings, outside of fetus development. It is an exclusive social relationship. Its potential emotional significance to the mother raises the question whether there is not a genuine loss in elemental mother love when the

[4] Frances Pitt, *Animal Mind*, chap. VIII.

baby has to be bottle fed. It is true that a woman "ought not to be considered a cow," as a medical specialist recently said, but nursing gives the mother an opportunity to continue for a time after the child's birth her building of his body, with a consciousness and a response from him not experienced during the earlier fetus stage. Fortunately the mother and bottle become so well connected together in the child's consciousness that the only difference between the breast-fed and the bottle-fed baby from this angle is the mother's failure to enjoy the fullness of relationship nature originally provided, making the nursing a pleasure to her as well as a delight to the child.

The weaning experience is likewise significant emotionally. It forces the child to step out of the contentment of the society of two and with more serious effort to attempt to do his part to satisfy his hunger. It also usually becomes for the mother a realization of the need and advantage of the child's moving on to greater maturity even though this demands changes in the mother-child relationship. It teaches her, although not always with conscious recognition, that her regard for and care of her offspring must, from time to time, find different expression. She is almost always eager for the change, and by keeping this disposition as she faces later the same necessity of accepting a new order of relationship she gains from the weaning experience both the willingness to transcend herself and her temptation to cling to the forms of self-giving that demand of the child emotional retardation.

This forth-going of the self, so that another individual gains such possession of the parent's attention as even to push into the background self-regard, is so prominent in the infancy relationship as to constitute its very essence. One of the first to appreciate the significance of this in the struggle for survival was Henry Drummond.[5] His thinking was stimulated by his recoil from the Huxleian interpretation of the struggle for existence. He brought in contrast the two main activities of all living organisms, nutrition and reproduction, and insisted that no true

[5] *The Ascent of Man.*

picture of evolution could be drawn that neglected the disposition to care for others. The behavior practices that have flowered into the sentiment of love were, as he saw it, indispensable if the life of the species was to be secured.[6] "Even at its dawn life is receiver and giver; even in protoplasm is selfism and otherism." He credited maternity with the chief contribution of this transcendency of self. We now know that the value of his emphasis was discounted by the biologists of his day because of the theological interest that inspired him to write his thesis. In the following words he shows that he has a grasp of the core of the mother-offspring relationship, that instinctive pressure toward the transcendency of self which, expressed in the automatic impulses, provided momentum for a line of behavior that, allied with the growth of emotional and intellectual experience, opened up opportunity for a progressive domestic institution and a complex social consciousness.

> . . . the passage from mere otherism, in the physiological sense, to altruism in the moral sense, occurs in connection with the due performance of her natural task by her to whom the struggle for the life of others is assigned. That task, translated into one great word, is maternity,—which is nothing but the struggle for the life of others transfigured, transferred to the moral sphere.[7]

Kropotkin, who, from a different point of view, revolted from the Huxleian interpretation of the struggle for existence, calls attention to the way in which the mother's sentiment for her child ranges beyond her own household. He finds the principle of co-operation, a socializing of maternal sentiment, clearest among those who are on an economic level that keeps them conscious of the difficulties of survival.[8] He insists that it takes considerable training in restraint to make it possible for those women who are economically more fortunate to pass by a shivering and hungry child without giving aid. Mothers of the poorer

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 225 *f.*
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 258.
[8] P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid*, p. 212.

class are not prepared thus to defend themselves against their native sentiments; they cannot easily refuse sharing what they have with a child obviously suffering for need of food, clothing, or shelter.[9] His testimony is reinforced by similar statements from a multitude of social workers who have lived in close contact with the underprivileged.

Kropotkin, in his illustration, brings into light one of the chief means by which the sentiments necessary for social organization are generated. No longer can this socialization be ascribed merely to maternal feeling. It is parent love, the maturing of emotions associated with the growth of the infancy period, that now supports these social practices, the benevolent expressions of the spirit of co-operation.

In *The Grand Strategy of Evolution,* Patten gives a still later interpretation of the reciprocal process "of self-creating and self-giving" as these two principles merge through co-operative action and organization and bring about the creation of larger individualities.[10] He, like Drummond, insists that every living thing displays this blending of two sets of impulses into one co-operative life-pattern.[11] He signalizes the contribution which, resting upon heredity, comes forth from the parent-child relationship by defining it as parental altruism. He conceives of this transcendency as the method of social reproduction, the way society builds itself.[12]

Although the transcendency of self, which in some measure is a prerequisite for any form of social organization, finds its most forceful and most reliable incitement in the disposition which is nourished by the parent-child association, this relationship does not have a monopoly of the influences that lead to the outward emotional spread of the individual, for there are other sources that contribute to this socializing process. Two of the most important of these, language and play, are conditioned by the

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 213.
[10] *Ibid.,* p. 134.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 135.
[12] *Op. cit.,* p. 405.

family. They naturally develop in the home and, with parent-feeling, provide a common support for advancement of culture. The significance of these two allies of the infancy period as influences in social evolution appears clearly when we examine their present functioning in the growing life of the child. Language and play both help the child to travel beyond his immediate self-interest, to achieve a degree of socialization, and thus operate normally in the family environment as a basis for training in co-operation.

Language and transcendency

Language is a symbolic technique permitting communication between individuals. It is a prerequisite in some form for all social organization, since without it there is insufficient contact, inadequate means of interaction, for the building of a stable relationship. The herd, in spite of its instinctive clustering, needs, in order to approach a semblance of social organization, means of communication. Gregariousness in its highest expressions creates sensitiveness in the members of the herd to the behavior of their fellows. This permits a common response to stimuli, and in the stampede of a flock, for example, following a warning cry of one of its members, we have a suggestion of the social advantage of symbolic communication. With the faculty of speech, however, this mechanism took on a new meaning and added immeasurably to the construction of society as distinguished from the herd.[13]

The individual has to make his own personal development in language experience, and this growth—a fusion of inner impulse supported by an increase of brain structure, with out-of-the-self suggestions stimulating imitation—necessarily proceeds during the formative stages of the infancy period and within a family setting.

Thus the family organization which the infancy period supports has as one of its important functions the introducing of the child to some sort of linguistic expression which will make

[13] W. Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, p. 34.

possible a self-conscious contact with his fellows. The establishment of intelligent communication permits the sharing of experience, an escape from the limitation of one's own individuality. The child not only gives himself to others in the ways that bring him most relief from the barriers of self and takes from his associates what they also are eager to impart but, in addition, has contact with the social wealth that has been gathered out of the experience of former generations and has been handed on through the resources of language.

This exchange of experience through the use of signs that have meaning is indeed the social fact par excellence,[14] but it is brought to the child by the family, which provides the indispensable means of imitation as the child gradually acquires the power of speech. Language presupposes in the child a readiness to use the domestic advantages just as its historic coming announced man's arrival at the developmental stage in his neurological, psychological, and social evolution necessary for the highest type of social contact.

In the child growth must reach the point where the memory can register the stimuli provided by the influencing adults. There is need also of an awakening awareness of others. This recognition, once it reaches a realization that others are individuals and have desires and needs as has oneself, becomes a transcendency as important for the socializing of the person as it is as the means of building and perpetuating society. It provides the basis for an unlimited social expansion, the realization of existing social resources and values that forces the child to give heed to desires and demands outside his own purposes.

Language also has to transcend the particular and find ways of generalizing experience in order to perform its social function. This process of generalization is in itself a socializing of thought. Each particular thing is transcended in the general notion. The social significance of this appears in the relation we find in primitive groups between the level of the culture and the number and the range of abstract ideas. A language that has to cling to

[14] J. Vendryes, *Language, A Linguistic Introduction to History*, p. 11.

individual notions hampers social development just as the child's inability to transcend his personal, particular experiences limits his social contact. Not only does language permit vicarious experience so that one can profit from what has happened to another, but it also reaches toward a universal experience, a social awareness that all members of the group can share because they can use the same language.

The indirect service of the family in stimulating and directing this development of speech in the young child becomes another domestic contribution to the evolution that enables one to hurdle over himself and become a member of a social group. The family, as a rule, performs its work so slowly and with such little conscious attention to what it is doing that the coming of speech into the life of the child, socially significant as it is, appears for the most part as a by-product of domestic interaction. The family does not usually attempt to build the language of the child but rather it encourages speech as it carries on its ordinary services and protective activities. The child also without self-decision moves into the family more thoroughly by his accomplishment of speech, his first awakening to the usefulness of communication—a tremendous moment because it ushers him into his first personal experience of the unique social contact made possible by language interaction.

Language as a social discipline also helps to carry the child beyond himself. Conventions are in large measure built into the child as attitudes toward words. Some are unseemly, and as a result emotional reactions similar to primitive taboos get tied to certain acts and ideas. Other words are encouraged, and the approval helps establish a favorable disposition toward a different set of behavior and thoughts. Much of this language fellowship of child and parent is carried on without self-consciousness. Emotional suggestions may even go contrary to what is accepted as the deliberate, intellectual program. The sex teaching of many parents is the best illustration of this. Naturally the parents' actual reaction as the child gets it is more influential than the fictitious struggle of the parent to impart ideas that he does not

honestly, that is, subconsciously as well as consciously, approve.

One of the earliest and therefore one of the most consequential introductions of the child into the social code is through word selection and word reaction as it takes place within the routine of family associations. Primitive people illustrate in a multitude of cases the strength and importance of this word-taboo and word-approval within the family.

Play and transcendency

Play is an experience that starts and develops during early childhood when the family is dominant. There is difference of opinion as to when and how play first appears in the life of the child, just as there are various theories as to its origin and purpose in the life of the race. There is, however, general agreement that play comes forth spontaneously, both in the experiences of higher animals and in the conduct of children. Play has so large a place in the growth period of the child that its start has been located in the fundamental repeating of stimuli that rehearse the event of birth.[15]

In psychological literature the play impulse is commonly regarded as instinctive. In any case, there is general recognition that play, whatever its explanation, has a large function in the development of the human child. It has two aspects, outer and inner, the first leading to motor activity and the other to mental imagery. Both provide means of self-escape, one giving entrance into the environment and the other freedom from the environment.

Although very early after birth the child begins to make adaptation to the world in which he has been placed, so that we see as early as the first day the contractions and dilations of the pupils,[16] the first person that emerges as an object dimly apprehended is some adult whose presence has been familiar, usually

[15] Bernfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
[16] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, p. 31.

the mother. In association with her, responses are made which, if not accepted as the beginnings of playful conduct, are certainly suggestive of what later appears in social play. As the child continues his growth, a large part of his energy flows out into playful activities. These may be solitary, either in phantasy experiences or motor manipulation of things, or they may find expression through association with others.

Phantasy play gives magic control beyond the powers of the self, and it is this that permits it so easily to become a hazard as the child's personality unrolls. Play with things, on the contrary, takes the self beyond itself by impressing upon the growing mind the limitations of the self and the need of learning to handle things that are independent objects that compose the environment. Social play, most of all, turns the attention of the child from himself and teaches him to find pleasure in the presence of others, in co-operation with others, and in rivalry with others. The trend of play—aside from phantasy—is to force a realization of the need of more than the self alone. Thus play provides another emergence, a transcendency of self in play with others rather than in the magic of its own creations.[17] Nothing more shapes the disposition of the developing personality than the play activities from their first expressions onward, and the greater part of this determining influence appears at the time when the family is supreme in its power to direct the child's playful impulses.

In the modern family, at least, we often have language, play, and relationship all tied together. The child's first attempts at language expression are made a part of a play fellowship. Parents accept the child's mistakes during his formative speech period, and as a result nicknames and the like become a part of a unique family vocabulary. This acts as a barrier that keeps others from the inmost intimacy of the household while at the same time intensifying the feeling of unity. The parents' attention as the child struggles to learn to speak becomes a stimulation not only

[17] Esther Loring Richards, *Behaviour Aspects of Child Conduct*, pp. 106-107.

to the child's effort to communicate but also to his feeling of belonging. The interest of the parent easily betrays him into the use of baby talk which, whatever its immediate results as a means of fellowship, may end in becoming in some degree a handicap to the child in his social contacts through a delay or failure in the attaining of a mature, correct speech.

Emotional maturity and love of others

The full meaning of the social value of transcendency cannot be had unless its reflex influence upon the emotional maturing of the person who experiences it is recognized. This, moreover, does not mean emotional maturity in the sense of some socially approved standard of conduct which is placed before human nature as an ideal toward which it should strive, but rather emotional maturity as a necessary adult quality without which the individual cannot achieve adjustment to himself or to others. The passage out of self-interest, or at least what is assumed as such, becomes a prerequisite to normality of personal experience. The truth of this appears in clinical diagnosis in both children and adults. The inability to give affection shows itself as one of the most important evidences of immaturity, significant because it not only leads to unhappiness, to an essential lack of success, but, what is more impressive, also to nervous illness.[18] Inwardly, the inability to love likewise brings its penalties, preventing the internal peace or serenity which is necessary for the development of a true emotional maturity.[19]

Such miscarriage of personality development must not be regarded as an ethical deficiency for which the individual should be blamed, even though it is something essential to social morality, but rather as a character defect behind which is a history of unwholesome personality growth. There has been in the shaping of the individual a failure to make the transcendency that human

[18] Maurice Levine, "Diagnosis of Normality," *Journal of Medicine*, August, 1939, p. 5.
[19] *Ibid.*

fulfillment requires. The individual may be pronounced selfish, egotistic, or exploiting, but this merely catalogues the significance society finds in his unfortunate behavior and outlook upon life. To find causation we must go searching back into childhood, and if our quest is successful we commonly discover that the difficulty did not originate within the individual but through failure on the part of those to whom he looked for the emotional security that affection alone provides. Some adult's inability to achieve transcendency in the presence of the child, to show him an undoubted love, led him to withdraw within himself rather than to draw away from himself toward others.

Thus self-interest in the supreme sense carries the person away from self-interest as a narrow and self-frustrating experience. In an analysis of such happenings, it is necessary always to remember that it is not the facts as one might objectively determine them but the situation as it appears to the child that counts. The parent may on account of a wrong policy, an assumed austerity for instance, give the child the feeling of being neglected, not wanted, or excluded from love, with the same consequences that would have followed the parent's indifference or hostility. The love the parent gives the child must take some form to which the child can be responsive. Its meaning must be found from the child's side and not in the construction that the parent or adult places upon it. This might seem difficult, as indeed the translation the child requires would be, were it not that mother love normally leads toward a transcendency of self that permits the parent to bring her love within the child's recognition. Fortunately, this is not by deliberation or by formula but merely because it is the natural thing for her to do. The child means so much to her that she steps outside herself and within his world and, being there, shows her love in ways that he cannot mistake. Even though this may seem and can become an adult catering to the child's egoism, it is fundamentally a socializing experience, the only way that he can escape anchoring himself within his own self-regard.

Lack of such an opportunity during the formative period of childhood becomes more than a mere emptiness to the individual; it is also a potential menace. One cannot safely announce an absolute determinism since character construction is always complex. The child may as an adult sublimate the loneliness of his first years by a magnificent service for the welfare of others. Nevertheless a child that has not in his formative period enjoyed the benefits of the transcendency of self on the part of some adult encounters hazards he cannot easily escape as his character takes shape. His misfortune may end in the most serious of results, in a psychotic maladjustment to life. Schizophrenia is an illustration of this type of disaster, in which the individual has walled himself away from others, living within a world of his own creation. The same tendency may show itself in milder form in persons who have the disposition always to look upon others as instruments for the furthering of self-interest.

These victims of a narcissistic attitude not only lose the satisfactions of a well-adjusted life but because of their self-centeredness are a menace to others. The greater their endowment, the more trouble they make. They are driven by emotional pressure that forbids their developing an intelligent program for the achievement even of their own personal interests. So far as the inwardness of their life is concerned, they are social outlaws. They were denied contact with the outcoming of transcendent attitudes at the strategic time, and as a result their own ability to go outside themselves is aborted. Dickens in his *Christmas Carol* pictured as vividly as has ever been done in literature the characteristics of such a personality, placing them in contrast with an extraordinary tenderness stimulated by the misfortune of Tiny Tim. The author in his story could provide a miracle so that Scrooge was finally re-created and assumed a normal life. This transformation is just what rarely happens in the everyday world. The inclination even to effect transcendency has been taken away, and efforts towards reconstruction find no footing. This, of course, is not the situation of the person, who, having once achieved a degree of out-of-self expression, is led through

religious conversion or some other influence to attempt to revive and extend the elemental experiences of early life that started him toward a measure of transcendency of self.

Excesses of parent love

The incentives to transcendency are like all other complex developments of evolution in that they bring with them liabilities. Modern life has led to such excesses in expression of mother love and father love that there has even come the danger of forgetting the more significant contribution that these emotional attachments make in developing the normality of the child. There are many reasons why the modern parent is more tempted than his predecessors to misdirect or overexpress the affection which he is so willing to give and the child is so eager to receive. Recent literature stresses especially the danger that the mother faces who has leisure, sensitivity, and especially at times a desire to use the child as an antidote for marital disappointment. It is not merely that there is a greater temptation for the modern parent to overindulge his hunger for child fellowship, but also that the conditions associated with modern civilization add to the risks of such practices. The child is freer to tie himself emotionally with his parent so firmly that he cannot detach himself in the way necessary to maintain his individuality in adolescence or even in his later adult career. The fixation that the parent may encourage can be maintained throughout life more easily than would have been possible when circumstances were harder, because of the greater economic security that the family may now enjoy. Fixation is not, of course, something that is economically determined, but nevertheless those who have leisure and a considerable social independence on account of favorable economic conditions are more open to the temptation than those who, as was true of families generally at a former time, are too busy and too hard pressed to indulge in any sort of orgy of emotion, even that of love.

The smaller family is another explanation of the greater risk

of fixation than once was true. Here again there is no absolute determination through size, as the Old Testament story of Joseph illustrates, but it is true that the family with one or two children provides more opportunity for unrestricted expressions of parental love than does a sizable household with several children of various ages responding to a common interaction, when neither parent is likely to have the time to overcultivate any particular child. The demands and needs of the others are too constant to permit such luxury.

The popularizing and effectiveness of contraception give no reason for supposing that we can turn back to large families as a means of protecting children from the emotional overindulgence of parents. Instead, the motive for safeguarding the growing personality of the child must come from the incentive to transcendency itself. Mother love does not need to be mutilated nor suppressed, but more sanely directed, influenced by a self-discipline which the mother acquires because of the fact that she so loves the child that she wishes it to have the best possible preparation for life. This is a much safer protection than that formerly given by large families. It requires insight on the part of parents and an alert public opinion, both of these furthered by an effective distribution of the knowledge science now has of the hazards inherent in the parent-child relationship.

It would be fortunate as a means of impressing parents if some ceremony could be socially established that would have for its function the same recognition of the maturity of the child, or at least of his need of emotionally breaking from the family, that was accomplished by the initiation ceremony at puberty among many savage tribes. The long-continued economic dependency of the young person is an obstacle that was not commonly present in the family relationship of primitive peoples.

Vicarious transcendency

Mother love in the period of evolution when human qualities first began to show themselves may have had a monopoly of the

incentives to transcendency, instinctively rooted, but at our later stage this is not true. Not only do we have mothers devoid of any such tendency, but we have, what is more important and impressive, both men and women who, without the experience of parenthood or independent of it, are carried beyond themselves in an emotional transcendency similar to that of normal parents through the affection they feel for children. The clearest evidence of this is found in foster parents and parents by adoption. In both cases the lack of blood relationship need not change the quality of the relationship of adult and child. Foremost among the motives that impel the adult to commit himself to the care of a child is, as the Brookses[20] tell us, a hunger of the heart. In other words, the desire to escape the isolation of self-life through the fellowship of giving and responding finds satisfaction through the fellowship of the adult and child linked together by love.

Not always does the adopting father or mother anticipate the emotional effect of bringing the child into the household. One woman who was adopted in infancy, writing at the age of thirty-seven, says that she has been told by relatives that her adopted father paid little or no attention to his own children but had become, to their great surprise, wrapped up in her.[21] This is an interesting example of the fact that there may be a vicarious transcendency even exceeding that associated with the ties of kinship. Not only do parents by adoption testify to the fact that the children they have invited into their homes become thoroughly theirs, just as certainly as children born into the home, but the most significant influence in determining the future of the child is the nature of the relationship that develops between him and his foster parents.[22] Whether there is any greater risk of the adopted child's encountering emotional destitution we do not know but the evidence is conclusive that there

[20] Lee M. and Evelyn C. Brooks, *Adventuring in Adoption*, p. 6.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 72, quoting Sophie van Senden Theis, *How Foster Children Turn Out.*

need not be any feeling of loss in the life of the child if he is adopted into a family that can give him the same reception that normally comes to the child of one's blood. Teachers, social workers, and others who have much contact with children also show a vicarious transcendency, but it is different in form, for such adults have a serial relationship with many different children rather than a concentrated and lasting one like that provided by family intimacy.

VII. *The Family Support of Culture*

LIVING AS ADJUSTMENT. The family's support of culture is based upon the necessity of using group resources in the human effort to survive. The first step in any analysis of these activities of the home means relating them to the fundamental life-principle—adjustment. A basic generalization of biological science is that the living organism finds its security in its ability to adjust. It must adapt itself to its environment or change the unfavorable conditions of the environment, or die. The human organism is no exception to this major principle of life. A fundamental purpose of man's behavior is adaptation. His only distinction comes from a superior intelligence that gives him greater control over his environment, a better opportunity to change antagonistic environmental influences, than that possessed by other organisms.

This process of adaptation is carried on in unnumbered ways every passing moment as the body functions to maintain its well-being and security. Under ordinary circumstances these physiological processes, although influenced by consciousness, proceed without attention from the self. In addition, there is a constant stream of activities that flow forth from conscious purpose.

This latter type of behavior has a larger range than the first, and out of it develops an adapting program that carries the individual beyond himself. Although no one believes that these processes that lead to social organization as a means of more intelligent adaptation are unrelated to the more basic automatic, organic activities, there are differences of opinion as to how far the first determine the second. Whatever the interpretation given of this relationship, there is general recognition that society is a human attempt to extend the processes of adaptation,

an effort to use in co-operation the human endowment of intelligence for security and satisfaction through an increased control over nature.

Although society functions as an organization for adjustment, any attempt to regard it as a superorganism leads to fallacy, because it is only in their purposes that the two are analogous. Any attempt to interpret one from the other leads to difficulty. Both operate within an influencing environment. This means that the self is confronted with a threefold relationship with adaptive activities going on continuously and reciprocally, clustering about three centers of interest which for clarity's sake we abstract as body, society, and physical environment.

Society, an extension of adjustment resources

Society may be thought of as an environment comparable to the physical reality, to which adaptation must be made. The individual must react to the presence of other persons and he must, for his welfare, adjust himself to others who are making the same effort as himself. Society can also be thought of as an organization that furnishes means of adaptation as a part of the life-process, just as the physical organism acts as a mechanism for body survival. From this angle, association, especially as it becomes orderly and co-operative, provides additional resources for human survival. This means the working together in various ways and in varying degrees of self-consciousness of members of the same group, who in concert do better than if each operated by himself. This is the point of view that was so forcefully emphasized by Hobbes in his famous analysis of the foundation of human society.[1]

There is another way in which society adds to the security of the human race and contributes advantageously to the struggle for a satisfactory life. It brings the natural impulses, that is, the organic modes of behavior characteristic of man, under the influence of group attitudes and thereby makes them function

[1] *The Leviathan.*

somewhat differently, in ways that in the long run provide better security than if they received no discipline.

This social process assumes the task of making man something other than he would be if he were left to himself. It is the socializing influence per se that necessarily produces elements of strain, of recoil, of exaggeration, an individual reaction that is quite different from the automatic mechanical processes of organic adjustment. Society gives men superior opportunity but at a cost that the individual frequently resists, especially as he develops more keenly his sense of individuality in consequence of a complex, highly artificial social organization. Man is not the only animal that meets with this social coercion, but in his case there is a self-consciousness that makes his reaction quite unlike that of the animal that has acquired an instinctive response to group relationship. As a consequence, what we call civilization—the refinement and organization of social interests and experiences—proceeds in constant lapses with the ever present possibility of a considerable rebellion of individuals who have organized in protest, a possibility always in the mind of the statesman.

It is again the child to whom we turn to find the clearest examples of this extension of the adjustment processes. It is indeed true that the child is born into the presence of human beings rather than into society.[2] These persons into contact with whom the child comes are, however, representatives of a system of human life which we call society. This is a generalization, to be sure, but human nature is, also. The word "society" attempts to signalize a certain sort of organization, modes of behavior that from what they do to people may be regarded both as processes and as a definite capital, gathered from human experience, which we think of as culture. This material in turn can be classified as physical and as psychic resources. It is the equipment that society has for its functioning, and the active, knowable ideas that have developed in a definite time and place.[3]

[2] Richard T. LaPiere and Paul R. Farnsworth, *Social Psychology*, p. 55.

[3] Albert Blumenthal, *The Best Definition of Culture*, pp. 12-13. (Pamphlet published by the Marietta College Press, Marietta, Ohio. December, 1937.)

Society has existence as a means of satisfying human need. On the lower levels it has its being in instinct, and although it maintains a narrow, automatic routine that has the same fundamental purpose as has the culture of humans, it must carry its resources in the form of automatic behavior. This stabilizes but it also limits the social expression. In contrast, human beings through their conscious communication carry on cultural transmission, and once experience is preserved by some form of written record, the stream of culture flows more swiftly and in greater volume. The underlying objective of this social accumulation is survival, but once energy is available beyond that required for stark physical survival, the striving for comfort, pleasure, and distinction enormously stretches the demands that adaptation attempts to satisfy.

The cultural complex made up of social organization activities and values has a greater range of variation than does man's biological mechanism. The individual organism has its uniqueness, but the pattern of behavior that works for survival is relatively fixed. It is otherwise on the social plane. This means that the term "society" is not only an abstract concept, but actually exists as a concrete, particular social system whose features at the moment reveal, in so far as analysis is possible, a multiplicity of influences, including climate, land, techniques, inventions, attitudes, and ideas.

Culture as increased resources

The material culture extends the physical resources of man so that he profits more from his expanding environment than he could from any possible accretion through the increase of dexterity or strength as a consequence of change in the organism. The tool ushers in a line of development that brings more advantage than could come by any conceivable structural development. Invention opens up resources for adjustment; and the present human career is an achievement possible only through this purposeful manipulation of the environment.

Man is still farther removed from the animal by his immaterial cultural possessions. Indeed, even the simple tool gets its greatest value because it conveys an idea as well as serving as an instrument, for it is the notion rather than the utensil itself that needs to be perpetuated socially, since its persistence not only means that the tool can be duplicated but that any improvement can be incorporated in the idea as it passes on from generation to generation. Immaterial culture in this sense is the perpetuation both of man's achievement in the manipulations he has carried on for adjustment to environment and of the ideas or convictions that he has gained from his experience, valued and preserved. Thus immaterial culture ranges from the idea of the bow and arrow, the planting of seed, the use of fire, and the like, to beliefs, magic, and taboo. In the simple cultures of primitive people the underlying motive of the ideas that have social support is adjustment.

Any analysis of the social function of the family needs first of all to place the institution within the cultural setting. Social beginnings are lost and at best our theories as to human evolution in its earliest stages can be no more than probabilities based upon speculation. Any attempt to establish a time sequence is futile and, in any case, of no consequence in our effort to get at the social contribution of either the historic or the modern contemporary family. The one thing that is plain in the study of the family in any time or place of which we have knowledge is the constancy of the interdependence of family and society. Culture, that is, society's resources, flows into the family, and from this institution consequences of domestic relationship enter the culture. This reciprocity takes place in both the material and the immaterial aspects of society's possessions.

The family and material resources

In simple society, where the economic function of the family stands out sharply, it is easy to see how important the home is as a depository both of the implements that make up the arts and crafts of the group and of the ideas that insure their prac-

tices. Since production centers so largely about the home, even if there were no special effort made to educate the child to carry on the material activities, his mere presence within the household, as a result of the native impulse to imitate, would bring about training needed later by him when he assumed the adult's task of carrying on his means of livelihood. Education in the arts and crafts is, however, too important to be left to such a spontaneous motive on the part of the child, even though in his play he does gain preparedness for his physical effort to survive. Parents are expected to do more than merely encourage imitative play. As the boys grow up they are initiated by their fathers into the customary occupations that constitute so large a part of the material culture of the people.

The investigation of any native industry reveals the part the home plays in this vocational training of the child. For example, in the Maori industry the boys, as they grew up, were given by the father introduction into the technique of various crafts, including the magical regulations that had to be observed. The boys also accompanied their fathers on hunting trips and were instructed in the economic ideas that they needed to carry on their lifework. On these expeditions they were taught not only the art of hunting and fishing, and favorable places for such enterprises, but also tribal boundaries and the scheme of ownership. In the same way the girls were being initiated by the mothers into weaving and other household arts.[4]

In the Congo we find the boy, as soon as he is strong enough to carry his food, trotting behind the father on the latter's trips and rejoicing even though staggering under the burden he has assumed.[5] In the same manner, the girl, in her contact with her mother, gains preparation for life.[6]

This training comes easily because of the appeal it makes to the child. Even in our sophisticated civilization we find the need of appealing to these same interests, since they furnish motives

[4] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, p. 176.
[5] G. Cyril Claridge, *Wild Bush Tribes of Tropical Africa*, pp. 104-105.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

for character education. Therefore, we have our Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and the like. How vitally these arts of life grip the savage child appears in the resistance that he makes to the formal school program when it attempts to usurp the pleasures of hunting or fishing.

Although for illustration of this recoil of children we do not have to travel back to simpler society, the following example shows the resistance the native child makes to an educational system quite unlike that which naturally flourishes in the parent-child relationship.

> The difficulty in native schools is to get these boys to attend regularly, for they delight in playing truant as much as any English boy. I remember a number of these boys playing truant, which was a bad example, as the school had an average attendance of two hundred scholars. We eventually pitted our wits against theirs, and after a long chase rounded them up in the river, returning from their expedition—a band of real Huck Finns, with strings of rats, fresh fish, birds (dead and alive), nests of eggs, and a quantity of caterpillars and other tasty grubs. They were marched back to school with their trophies, and lined up in front of the others, to the uproarious merriment of their schoolmates, who, in their hearts, lionised and envied them.[7]

In such an occurrence we have a revelation of the sociological stubbornness, the absence of adjustability, that has made the contact of a dominant culture, forcefully maintained, so deadly to the social stability of simpler people. Policies built upon sympathetic insight easily prevent this by providing a training that successfully ties rudiments of European culture to the fundamental productive practices of native people. The indifference of government officials, and even of philanthropic missionaries, to this need of making any education that is pushed upon children of simple cultures recognize and use the appeal of their native material culture explains in part the frequent disintegrating

[7] Dugald Campbell, *In the Heart of Bantuland*, p. 170.

influence of programs sincerely intended to lift the standards of life of primitive people.

It would be a mistake to think of culture flowing into the household in two distinct streams, material and immaterial. Actually, these two types of interest, as they come to the child through the instruction of the parent, are so bound together that no distinction is made. We are told that the industrial training of the Maori did, in fact, contain three elements: economic lore, technique of craftsmanship, and magic. This separation into three branches was, however, not in the mind of the parent, for to him all three were one, although training in each was considered indispensable.[8] To leave out magical procedures supported by social tradition as part of the procedure in any productive effort would be to the mind of primitive man inconceivable, and this attitude reappears in the thinking of the child as a matter of course.

When the effectiveness even of tools and instruments depends upon their *mana*, that is, their magic quality,[9] it follows that every sort of vocational training must proceed in the setting of the prevailing immaterial culture. Separation between the two cannot be made by those partaking of the social beliefs of their time and place. In this fact we find an additional explanation of the disintegrating effect of the clashing of two opposite cultures when the children of natives are forced to assimilate the habits and standards of more advanced people. Disintegration is likely to show itself most of all within the home where the child and parent find themselves emotionally separated by an alien influence.[10]

The family and immaterial culture

Feeling, as preliterate people do, that adjustment to the prevailing beliefs and attitudes is at least as necessary for adjustment

[8] Firth, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

[9] Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality*, pp. 386-387.

[10] W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, vol. 2, pp. 1647-1653.

to life in the struggle for survival as any technology of production, it follows that the child within the family circle is as quickly and as firmly introduced to the immaterial possessions of the group as he is to those that directly, according to our thought, furnish the means of livelihood. This cultural material is presented to the child as a matter of routine along with the other teachings and activities of the household. It is, therefore, not thought of as something special, although it may be so brought to the child as to have greater meaning than ordinary practices and instruction.

As an example of what actually happens, we can take the case of taboo as it concerns itself with food. No prohibition coming forth from the social life of the group has had greater compulsion than the belief that certain foods must not be eaten or that there is an advantage from partaking of others that are supposed to have magical effect. Food that from a modern, objective point of view would be nutritious and desirable has frequently been made socially so unlawful that even the accidental taking of it into the mouth has been the cause of a tremendous fear, in some cases causing death. An instance of this kind is recorded by Howitt.[11]

Conscious attitudes are easily tied up with the first experiences of the child in the taking of food. In modern life there are innumerable illustrations, known to everyone, of the easy way in which children can be influenced for or against certain sorts of food by the attitude of the parent. In these instances, rarely is there any effort to condition the child for or against such food material. In the savage, however, there is the strongest incentive to force the child into the food conventions, since there is believed to be danger to all concerned if the food habit enforced by taboo is broken by the child. The taboo does not represent mere disapproval but an extraordinary emotional avoidance that is rooted in some magic conception and enforced by the entire psychology of the natives. Magic tends to enter the field of diet

[11] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 756-770.

and to establish the strongest sort of taboo.[12] The forcefulness of such instruction cannot be appreciated unless it is remembered that the most dire consequences imaginable in the thinking of the savage follow any infringement of food taboo. Because of this, the teaching, as it comes to the child, has a constancy, a firmness, and an atmosphere of dangerous mystery that lodges it deeply in his consciousness.

The whole significance of this training cannot be understood unless one realizes that the impressions gained in childhood become a life-habit that is held with the same emotional intensity by the adult, or perhaps with even greater feeling because its reason for being has been apparently demonstrated in the adult career. There is nothing quite comparable with this in our modern culture, although race hatred, class superiority, and extreme nationalism suggest a similar emotional rooting. The difference is that there is almost always, sooner or later, some antidote in the cultural complexity in modern civilization that counteracts these early impressions. Not so with the savage unless his culture is in collision with that of another people and in the process of disintegration. Thus it comes about that the family not only has the first opportunity to expose the receptive child to immaterial culture and meets with no genuine competition, but also in addition is supported by a massive, consistent, unyielding, social approval.

A similar situation exists along other lines than food teaching. For example, nothing is more rigid, pervasive, or ultimately significant in any social group than the attitudes and practices that fix and define the status of woman. These come early to the child and with such a force that they can actually weaken or lower the fellowship of mother and offspring. A New Guinea study portrays a domestic situation in which a child of three leaves her father's arms and goes to take, as a matter of proprietary right, the nipples of the mother, and then, when hunger has been satisfied, returns to the father, grinning overbearingly at the mother who even at so early an age is thought of as a

[12] J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, p. 24.

domestic pawn.[13] In such a setting, where the routine expresses a prevailing social sentiment and the inferiority of woman socially is accepted without question as something proper, something necessary, and something that could not be changed without disaster to all, the child's convictions at a very early age become such that the man has no incentive to change in later adult life the sex code of his childhood, and the woman accepts without question the situation that has always existed throughout her experience and that she has no thought of challenging.

The family and social introduction

Although the family is not, as a rule, given a delegation of authority in simple society in the sense that there is a conscious, deliberate program that turns certain functions over to the home and reserves others to the community, the flow of culture does, in fact, bring to the family the opportunity and the necessity of acting as a cultural medium. Culture, which furnishes to the family its functions and its content, assigns to the child-parent relationship the task of introducing the child into the social substance that is to be so large a part of his own individual personality.

Because of this the family can be thought of as an organization operating between the individual and the outside community life. From a different point of view, it seems more like an inner circle of interest ever in relationship with what in contrast is the world outside. Whichever emphasis the family is given at the moment, its significant functioning is in the way it ties the child to the social group and removes from him any expression of individualism that might become hazardous to the social order. This training the family must accomplish, for only so can the group survive. The elemental parent-child relationship is used by the group and upon it is laid increasing social responsibility. This accretion, which in turn builds the family as an important social structure, comes not from forethought, at least to any great

[13] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, p. 73.

extent, but as a natural result of using the already existing and available opportunity provided by the home for security of the group itself. The individual is led into a routine, both of behavior and of attitude, which soon has such a habit-character, and is so compelling, that it does not appear as coercion but as the only way of right living. Indeed, it is so accepted as a matter of course that any other way is unthinkable.

The importance of this service of the family to society cannot be appreciated unless it is remembered that the greater part of the effect of the home is not the product of design, a conscious process of instruction, but the taking over by the child of influences that are powerful because they are so persistent and so much a part of the parents' own life that they are unrecognized. It is the frequency and the naturalness of this cultural transference that more than anything else firmly establishes the instruction in the personality of the growing child. In our own time this pervasiveness of the routine of the family enters profoundly into the personality of children, just as it has from the beginning.

It is perhaps easiest, however, to see this assimilation in the absence of any endeavor to influence the play of young children. It is commonplace to see the younger child making great effort to do the same thing as one who is considerably older. Thus on the playground one may find some child too young to join in the sport of others observing what happens and, by himself, carrying out as well as he can the motions that he notices. Better still, he and a group of approximately the same age will be trying to carry on, even without understanding any of its rules, some game in process near by. These imitations are revealing, but they only suggest the powerfulness of stimuli pouring forth from family routine again and again and acting upon the growing child as personality-making influences.

Under any condition, this environmental bombardment would be effective during the formative period, but its penetration is all the greater because of the tendency of the child to absorb and imitate. He welcomes such stimuli because he has need of

them. His developing personality is as eager for these contributions, born of his circumstances, as his body is desirous of food. The dominance of these household influences is all the greater because of his lack of any critical discrimination. This readiness to accept what happens to come shows itself in the modern child just as it does in the child of the most primitive society. The only difference is that in our time the child is likely to discover social inconsistencies, the conflict of diverse practices and attitudes. Even in the parents he is apt, surprisingly early, to feel differences of reaction and behavior, and as he grows older, more and more his contact with others uncovers the diversity of the stimuli coming forth from his social environment. The home that is broken by the emotional cleavage of the father and mother who are entangled in incompatibilities only brings to high relief what in more fortunate homes is merely a difference that emphasizes to the growing child the unlikeness of his parents.

A distressing illustration of the uncritical disposition of the child which prepares him to take over without discrimination whatever impresses him, even though it be contrary to his welfare, appears in the ease with which children take on hypochondriacal attitudes. The parent who complains of illnesses, real or imaginary, in the presence of his child, becomes an emotional hazard because of the readiness of his offspring to accept suggestion. The result may be a morbid fear of illness or, more often, a chronic habit of complaining.[14] These patterns that become a lifelong handicap may be built in the child, in spite of the parent's lack of wish to bring this about and without his realization, because of the reflective disposition of the child.

Family influence and the unconscious

In simpler cultures the family functions in a social environment relatively consistent and unchanging, and the influences

[14] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, p. 459.

that pour upon the child are in full accord with what he will later encounter when he leaves the home. At least the continuity is far greater than at present as the family functions in our discordant and rapidly changing civilization. As a consequence, the earliest teachings of the family, both those that are purposeful and those that emerge from routine, are laid down in the first emotional strata of the child's development, but their expression later may be checked by the antagonisms they encounter even from the parents, who are chiefly responsible for their presence in the child's life, and more often by the reception they receive from other adults.

Such personality-making influences are planted too substantially to be merely wiped away when they encounter opposition. They also may become too thoroughly a part of the personality to be cast aside through the victim's greater knowledge and maturity. As a consequence, they may establish an underlying life-disposition which in neurotically inclined persons disrupts emotional integrity, hampering adjustment and undermining happiness. In any case, the accumulations of the unconscious reveal the forcefulness of influences generated in the parent-child relationship. When they become obstructions to happiness they bear testimony to the power of the family-setting upon the character of the child as this gradually shapes itself during the growth period. These mishaps in character construction may be regarded as social malpractice, but they also show the strategic position the family necessarily holds in the making and maintaining of society.

It is interesting, in the light of the criticism that the modern family is receiving because of a misuse of its dominance of the child, that we find in simple society very definite recognitions of the need of putting a time-limit upon the authority and influence of the parents, especially of the mother, over the child. For this purpose the initiation has developed. Wherever it has come into being it gathers great ceremonial significance and separates the period of child-life from that of adult responsibility. Frequently it is the most emotional occurrence in the entire

career of the individual. If the teaching of the family were at variance with the practices and beliefs of the outside community, the latter would rival the family as the primitive educational agency. Its rights, its mysteries, its tests of self-control and social docility would give it the power of competition with the power the home has because it gets the child in the earliest years. There is not, however, in savage societies the feeling that the family is hazardous because its instruction is out of accord with the culture of the group, but rather there is the belief that the personal ties of parent and child need for the advantage of all concerned to be severed.[15]

The boy may be permitted to go back after his initiation to his home, but he must restrain expression of affection. If the boys who have been placed in seclusion as part of the initiation process are given greater liberty at night, they are not permitted to return to their homes. Frequently those who are initiated are required to join secret societies. There are various motives for these organizations which undoubtedly, in the transition from home to group interests that the initiation celebrates, furnish the boy—and the girl also, where women maintain societies—a new feeling of relationship that lessens the emotional meaning of the break with the home.

Social standardization

In primitive society the efficacy of the family in giving the growing child its existing culture is such that when this instruction is later enforced by the initiation processes, designed to wipe out thoroughly any adolescent tendency to nonconformity, a barrier is made against any later departures that would bring about emotional conflict. The personality is too thoroughly saturated with the existing culture to develop any marked individuality such as in our time may bring profound clashing between the emotionally rooted instruction given in the family

[15] W. D. Hambley and Charles Hose, *Origins of Education Among Primitive Peoples*, p. 145.

and later ideas that have been acquired from out-of-the-home contact.

Primitive man, if he can avoid a superior culture, may be saved from the inner conflicts of loyalty that play such havoc with modern personalities, but, as a consequence, he is subjected to a relatively stationary type of culture. Changes, however desirable, come slowly in a system of life that has crystallized in such great firmness. Even in the rapidly changing, discordant culture of modern civilization we find innumerable examples of individuals so thoroughly steeped in family tradition that they block with great emotional intensity any effort toward changing what for generations has been a routine or a belief transmitted by family descent. These people suggest the solidness of primitive culture because of its family support and the effectiveness of the institution as it functions to fashion the child's cultural disposition.

It must always be remembered that the child's susceptibility to the influences of his home is that of the whole person. It is personality in its completeness that reacts, and the culture received cannot be thought of as an aspect of the person; it sinks so deeply into the growing character that it is the social self, not a specialized portion of his interests or activities. In a sophisticated, complex culture, one can easily think of himself in separation from the culture that he received in his earlier years, the culture surrounding him in the community, or the culture that he conceives of as supremely desirable. Primitive man is too thoroughly family-made and his family is too greatly permeated with the existing culture for these distinctions to occur. Failure to achieve oneness with the practices and beliefs of the group would rob him of the social support necessary for his survival.

The family and the folkways

The material that the family transmits is, according to sociological principles, divided into the *folkways* and the *mores*. The folkways represent the habits of the group. They are the prod-

ucts of the effort to live, which through the test of expediency have become automatic practices, customs that are repeated so much as a matter of course that they seem in human behavior very like the instinctive reactions of animals. They are occurrences whose origin is hidden by the anonymity of the distant past but, however started, they constitute the group-approved practices. Although they are mass phenomena, it is reasonable to assume that some of them came forth from family experience and were spread by family interaction until they registered under certain circumstances proper group behavior. In any case, the folkways, once established, are carried into the individual families and are there enforced and interpreted. Folkway material made up a large portion of the instruction transmitted from parent to child.

This process of bringing the child into conformity with the current folkways goes on now as undoubtedly it has from the earliest days of society and, for the most part, by the same automatic, docile, and undiscriminating repetition that the individual of higher culture so quickly notices in the social practices of simpler people. In each culture the family becomes so subservient to what is, that the tendency in even the most sophisticated home is to take as a matter of course a great part of the prevalent folkways. The family, sensitive to these orthodox social habits, spends much of its energy in bringing the child into conformity with the customs.

The family and the mores

The folkways are not of equal importance. There are customs that stand out from the others because of their greater meaning. Violation of these especially important customs meets with severe social disapproval. They represent infringements of moral principles and strike at the security of the group and, therefore, are not permitted. This special class of folkways—customs that preserve the moral values—since William Sumner's epoch-making classification, has been defined as the *mores*. They com-

mand the family, as do the other folkways, but with even more coercive influence. The parent cannot maintain his own social standing unless he not only observes the mores himself, but also successfully brings the child to feel, as he does, that other ways of acting are immoral. Indeed, the family, like other institutions, is, as a cultural organization, a product of the slow accumulations of behavior patterns and applications of mores that have clustered about domestic interaction. This accretion of customs, folkways, and mores appears in other social institutions, but in none do they have such great, constant, culture-determining significance as in the family.

VIII. *The Family Support of Formal Institutions*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FORMAL INSTITUTIONS. In its widest meaning the social institution is the focus of human interests about which gather specific values and practices which have come from experience and are maintained by group approval. The *mores* and *folkways* are illustrative since they represent a collection of group-accepted conventions, conventions that have been organized about every major human interest. Wherever standards of behavior have come into being we have the recognition of the necessity for group welfare of regulating the actions of the individual person by setting up a pattern of behavior sanctioned by public opinion. Each institution is the product of a growth process, an accretion usually gathered over a long period of time reaching back far beyond the memory of those who support the social program. To find the institution's origin we must search the development that brought it forth.

From a narrower viewpoint we speak of the institution of the Church or the State. We are then referring to the more formal type of organization, the concentration of a multitude of interests about one central kind of group welfare. The family is such a type of institution. There are others, and the family is necessarily related to each of them. Each of these in turn affects the family. Although they are products of experience ranging over a great duration of time, a synthesis of ideas and practices that have received group approval, they are also the products of purposeful, consciously directed efforts in which the interests of the institution loom large. Because of this, the help of the family is enlisted by other formal institutions for their support

in the same manner that a part of the family's functioning is directed toward its own survival.

Survival and the formal institution

The explanation of the origin of the formal institution is the self-same principle of survival that appears so clearly in the functioning of the family. The fact that the institution is a product of the will-to-live processes, a group discovery in adaptation, is forcefully stated by Lester Ward when he insists that no social institution has ever come into being except as a response to human need, therefore being in a scientific sense a social necessity.[1] This should be self-evident, provided it is not interpreted to mean that the institution has always been in fact, when viewed in the spirit of objective science, an advantage as a means of human survival. A social function has been its underlying purpose; but not only has it been frequently inconsistent and ill-adapted to the existing circumstances, but at times what once under different conditions was useful has been continued beyond its need as the outworn customs that Ward has called *social vestiges*.[2]

Even when some portion of an institution, precisely tested, clearly shows itself an obstacle rather than a help in the program of adjustment, from a larger viewpoint when appraised as to its value as a means of bringing the individual under group control and providing social stability, it has to be given a more generous judgment. In such examination of an institution it has to be recognized also that expression of the will-to-live often must be found, not in the value of the institution to the mass, but in the advantage it affords to a group of dominant individuals who make use of their opportunity to direct the coercive forces in the attempt to maintain conditions that give them their social authority.[3] There are also institutions that are tolerated because they

[1] Lester F. Ward, *Pure Sociology*, p. 268.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Joyce O. Hertzler, *Social Institutions*, p. 21.

are not troublesome enough to challenge inertia. Human need, therefore, as the basis of the organization of institutions, has to be taken in the widest sense.

When we come to the more formal institutions, however, we find, whatever their manipulations, that they are organized about some compelling human need and function not consistently but in large measure in such a way as to further not only the security of the group but also the well-being of the majority of individuals; or at least, within the framework of the particular time and place and according to the existing insight, they are regarded as useful in the struggle to live.

There are also exploiting as well as lagging institutions. These are not without some basis of appeal, for otherwise they would not have come into existence nor would they continue to maintain themselves. They are perversions rather than fulfillment of social function. The white slave traffic (using the term as interpreted by sociologists) is an illustration of an exploiting institution. It has a relation to a by-product of the sex impulse, prostitution, but its function even in the field of vice is parasitic. Ward's generalization resulted from a more narrow, selective definition of institution than a realistic interpretation of social organization permits.

The child's entrance into institutional traditions

The formal institution lives through the child. Although its functioning may be chiefly on the adult level, its existence is short if it does not from time to time bring in new support by the enlistment of those passing out of childhood and assuming the adult career. This conversion of oncoming generations is the indispensable procedure for the institution that must secure itself as well as minister to human need. This means that it is the child, his susceptibility to the influences of those who are older, particularly his parents, that makes possible the ongoing of the institution. This is recognized in the program of the formal institutions, for even in the social life of simple people we find

routines and preachments that are clearly designed to shape the child and make him a maintainer of the organization. In this process nothing is more important than the early inculcating of the traditions.

It is necessary to notice how helpless the child is. He has no way of escape so long as culture is relatively simple. All the forces that play upon him, particularly those of his own household, force him to take on the customs, to accept the traditions as a matter of course, and to feel toward them in the way that leads him in turn, when he reaches the status of an adult, to force them on others who are making, as he did previously, passage through childhood.

The child is helpless because he is without culture. He must develop social habits of value or he cannot pass out of childhood dependency. His social development comes by accumulation, even though it is motivated by fundamental urges that come to expression or take new form as he advances. He has no way of building a cultural system out of his own needs, because in his contact with those who are older, in a relationship based upon his physical necessity, he is brought into contact with an existing system of social coercion which is not the less effective because it is for the most part welcomed by him. He must assimilate social values. He must learn social practices. He must develop a sense of membership in the group. Otherwise he is without social development, and isolation is for him more deadly than it would be even for the adult.

This means that the family has a major role in the maintenance of other formal institutions. Not only do the parents make use of the power they have over their child to establish the family itself, but along with this effort, with greater or less consciousness, they force upon the child, both by example and precept, the ideas, the routines, and the attitudes that are needed to give social continuity to the other formal institutions. The child may balk, and in modern family life this experience is common. Nevertheless, the influence of the family in simple society is irresistible, and in our most complex civilization it is in the very great

multitude of cases effective. Particularly is this demonstrated by the child's gradual acceptance of social status. This is the basic conformity upon which the stability of the group depends. If the child should pass into adulthood alien to sentiment, eager to carry on eruptive, revolutionary activities, social continuity would break down, and this is one thing that no group can permit.

The child's own culture

Children attempt to make and maintain their own culture. Their efforts in this direction appear in one of the most interesting features of child-life, play. Since it is in this activity that they enjoy the freedom necessary for the feeling of self-direction, it is there that we see such cultural experience as they possess as a result of their own initiative. Even in play we find, of course, a considerable amount of imitation of adults; but children's tendency to organize clubs and gangs accompanied with the idea of secrecy and separation reveals their eagerness to have a territory of experience that belongs only to them and from which they can, at least in some degree, shut out adults. Even though much of this is the result of suggestion, there can be no question of the attraction such undertakings have for children nor of their value as contributions to emotional growth, although too frequently environmental circumstances tend to make the secret gang or club detrimental to good social adjustment.

There is a continuity in the child's own culture that is rather surprising when one remembers how spontaneous its transmission has to be, since there exists, in contrast with adult organizations, no formal institution to assume such a responsibility. It goes on year after year, especially through games, each generation of children passing them on to those who follow. It is more than the rules of a game or the skill required, for it includes what in an adult sense may be described as standards and traditions.

This ongoing of the child's native culture appears also in practices that characterize the boys and girls of a neighborhood

or a school. Gang spirit is an example, and its persistency is not only vexing to adults but is a revelation of the independent line of transmission that children and youth keep within their own hands.

One of the traditions that is maintained year after year may be the notion that the adult is an alien—one who must be forced out of the child's self-made world. The latter's love of caves, huts, or other private and often secret meeting places is another evidence of his feeling of having a cultural possession and his eagerness to separate it from the adult world. The ease with which this can be turned against officials or organizations like the school is one of the hard lessons that men and women who attempt to direct children and youth frequently learn when they have failed to recognize the existence and strength of the child's own culture. The George Junior Republic was founded on the appreciation of the naturalness of this cultural development among children and the necessity of giving it expression under skillful adult guidance. No organization for children prospers that forgets this principle.

The family also helps the child most in his development of his own culture when it appreciates the wisdom of allowing self-expression. As a rule, parents because of their own childhood experiences welcome this child-supported culture. Even the vocabulary of children in their own social affairs is influenced by the fact that older people do not usually try to furnish a substitute but allow a special language relating to the child's social interests to develop.

The weakness of the child's native culture is its lack of effective means of continuity. It passes ordinarily with the play period, and its going is hastened by the incentives, so strong in the teen period, to enter as much as possible into the adult world. A limited organization exists, and traditions that at least in some measure are handed on to others are recognized. Nevertheless, the culture that accompanied childhood terminates. Adult culture is so overwhelming, so self-contained, that it provides little contact with that of the child. To be sure, many an adult looks

wishfully back to his childhood concerns and even attempts to recapture his one-time enthusiasms, but always such interests are regarded as recreation, something outside the serious adult world.

Family co-operation and other institutions

The social significance of the parent-child relationship explains the pressure of other formal institutions upon the family which leads the latter to serve the former and to accomplish this without any feeling that the various organizations are competitors, administering divided social interests. Instead the family takes over its responsibilities to the other institutions as a matter of course, and so ties up its activities with their interests in the efforts it makes to maintain itself that all it does for the child seems one complete program for the well-being and good adjustment to life of all its members. No socializing process could do so much to further the ongoing of other formal institutions as this spontaneous, continuous transforming activity of the family which brings the child to the acceptance of the traditions of its elders so thoroughly that they seem second nature.

The readiness of the child to absorb the material which society brings him, and to conform to the patterns of his time and place, conceals the fundamental importance of this assimilation in the sociological processes. This explains the scant attention that social science has given to the parent-child relationship as the means by which society maintains itself. Attention instead has been directed to the contacts of the adult person, and interaction on this plane rather than on that of childhood has been chosen for study and theorizing. This emphasis, so contrary to the way in which society maintains itself generation after generation, has thrown sociological interpretation out of perspective. One evidence of this neglect of the fundamental cultural transmission is the lateness of the development of a serious functional interest in the family. The social scientist busied himself with the analysis of concepts that drew their interest from an arbitrary selection of adult modes of behavior, frequently rationalizations

made possible by exaggeration of the role of intelligence, while the family received consideration only as a historic and formal institution.

It is interesting now, looking backward, to see that the pressure that led the social scientist to a serious interest in the family and its functions came from parents, teachers, and social workers who were obliged to deal both with the problems of children and with problem children, and who turned to the psychological and social scientists for greater insight. The child was studied for his own sake, and the possibilities and resources of parenthood were considered for the purpose of helping individuals to meet more adequately their opportunities and responsibilities. As a result of this interest, which G. Stanley Hall was one of the first in the United States to accept as a challenge to science, the sociologists began to recognize the cultural service of the family. A place was found for domestic interaction, but without greatly disturbing the generalizations that had been formed through concentration upon adult experience.

It is difficult to see how the science can be realistic in its attempts at analysis of the socializing process unless there be a genuine reconstruction of social thought with recognition of the family's primary place in socialization. The family is denied its proper value in the production and maintenance of culture so long as it is regarded as merely another institution. Science must place it in the same position that it has been given by human evolution. The ancient proverb, "The child is father of the man," came closer to the reality of social transmission than most of the systematic theories of society. It remained for psychiatry to uncover the full meaning of the maxim. Just as childhood sires the individual, so the family becomes the mother of society.

The family and institutional variation

Rigid as the social institution seems, it is not immutable. Its own survival depends upon its adjustment to changing circumstances. Changes sometimes come about so slowly that they are

imperceptible except over great ranges of time and, on the contrary, as in our own present national experience, sometimes occur so rapidly as to make the accommodations seem backward. Without yielding characteristic form or basic principles or functions, the institution, whether it consists of doctrine or of a formal organization, has an amazing ability to reconstruct itself so as to maintain its social prestige and authority.

Thus the social institution maintains two processes of adjustment, one bringing the people into line with social conditions and the other reforming the institution itself from time to time that it may persist in its activity. The family has a large part in this secondary adaptation. Innovations not only occur most naturally within the individual household, but when once started their spread also is largely through the contact of one family with another.

An illustration of this is the development of the various unorthodox forms of American family life. The Oneida Community may be taken as an example. Its departure from the standard monogamic system prevailing at the time seems to have begun in the attempt to establish a code of conduct that would take care of the love alliances that had arisen from the intimacy of the Noyes and the Cragin families.[4] In this instance, not only did the new doctrine spread from family to family but it also grew in strength, finally making all members of the organization a part of a great self-contained and self-supporting family.

Even when there is abject docility on the part of the child, his imperfect reception of suggestions opens up the possibility of change. This, however, is not the chief source within the family of variation. The child is lacking in an aggressive, consistent disposition to do differently from his parents, and therefore his failure in imitation does not usually bring forth a lasting departure from routine or traditions. It is the adolescent who offers the greater chance for innovations because of the invitation which the entrance into puberty, with its accom-

[4] Robert Allerton Parker, *A Yankee Saint*, p. 121.

panying physiological changes, offers for variation. The initiation ceremony in simpler societies attempts to take care of this hazard of youth's attack upon the status quo. The Oneida Community experience illustrates this also. It was the emotional revolt of the young people of the Community, their disillusionment and opposition to the Community's folkways, that undermined and destroyed the organization.[5]

Institutions are not perpetuated by inertia or mere acquiescence, as might seem to be true because of the fact that traditions and social organizations are carried forward from one generation to another by processes of assimilation that seem continuous.[6] This notion, however, is a deceiving interpretation of what takes place. The transmission is not a mere neutral taking on, but a positive absorption and imitation, which intermittently brings forth in the consciousness of those who are being molded feelings of strain. There is action and reaction, inviting all the emotional attitudes that accompany any sort of individual training. There is the striving to imitate, the effort at prestige, the winning of security, and also the balking against pressure, the searching for ways of escape, and the generation of hostility.

These acceptances of institutional coercion or recoil from it ordinarily appear in the inward feelings of the individual. Adults, singly or in combination, may thus react; but it is the child who characteristically reveals the ambivalent attitude of wishing to respond to, and also escape from, the demands of the adult manipulated institutions.

In a sense society may be said to be carried forward on the backs of institutions. The basic social thinking, feeling, and the advantageous adaptations, or at least those that are so regarded, are taken from the past, maintained in the present, and given to the future by the institutions. This function of the institution as a carrier of culture is not, however, a consistent conveyance, a thoroughly ordered ongoing all along the line; it is, instead,

[5] Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House*, p. 160.
[6] L. T. Hobhouse, *Social Development*, p. 212.

a piecemeal transmission, an advance of a separate social interest about which the various institutions organize and march forward but in differing steps. Accommodation is persistent but does not progress everywhere at the same rate or with equal success. There is, however, a common linkage between the various institutions, so that even when rivalry exists between them in their appeal to human nature, the perpetuation of one tends to help others in their going onward. When evolution gives way to revolution, the attack on any particular institution spreads beyond its own sphere and involves many institutions or for the moment antagonizes the process of social conveyance itself.

Family variability must be recognized in its relation to other institutions. The particular family shows favoritism even in its selection of its alliances. Within the family itself there is also constant evidence of the differences in the attitudes of its members when contact is made with other institutions. A child also may be more easily brought into allegiance with one than with another. The situation in any particular family has to be found by specific analysis. The family, however, as an institution tends to maintain common ground with the other flourishing institutions, in part because there is a natural tendency in all of them to standardize their leadership on the older, adult, plane of experience. The family program may be such that the child is made to recoil from all institutional authority and find eventually in cynicism or in rebellion an outlet for long continued grievances. The social situation is interpreted as a conspiracy of institutional leadership; and through excess of dominance the family comes to be, so far as the growing child is concerned, a disorganizing rather than a conserving influence.

In any case, the contribution of the home must be found not in its sentiment or purposes, but in its accomplishments. These are disclosed in the later reactions of the individual who in childhood took on as a consequence of family influences the fundamental social disposition. Unsocial or antisocial attitudes may be rooted in the suppressions forced on the child by the

home. These may have resulted from the determination of the parents to force the child to a docile acceptance of the authority of other institutions, such as, for example, school or church. The individual not only repudiates the out-of-the-home domination but that of the family itself. He classes together all the institutions that he interprets as fellow-members of a conspiracy against self-expression.

Concept and structure

Sociologists, since the days of William Sumner,[7] have recognized that the institution, when dissected, yields two distinct elements. One, the basic concept, the psychic element, is the interest or attitude, and the other is the structure that provides the means for expressing the concept in action. Both features are present in the formal institution, although the social organization which gives the underlying concept its means of functioning is more likely to attract attention. However, underlying the social machinery is its psychic purpose. The history of formal institutions—for example, the Church—shows how naturally its supporters separate into those chiefly concerned with the formal organization and those primarily interested in its underlying spiritual or human basis.

The formal institution represents a high development of structure. It is an administering organization, operating a considerably specialized establishment which has been built upon the motivating idea or sentiment. In any attempt to analyze the support the family gives to the other social institutions, recognition must be made of the two elements that are contained in even the most formal type of social institution. The basic need of the institution is to have built into the growing personality sympathy with and commitment to the psychic core about which the structure centers. In practice the parent may enlist the interest of the child by training that chiefly guides his actions. This is effective because the child naturally seeks action.

[7] W. G. Sumner, *Folkways*, pp. 53-54.

He is repelled by abstractions and attracted by concrete performances, especially when they offer opportunity to imitate his elders. It is easy to see the psychology of this illustrated in the behavior of primitive peoples. The training of the Maori child may be taken as an example. His preparation may be said to start with the earliest years, since even before the child appreciates what the parents are doing, they are through magic ceremonies attempting to get him ready for his later responsibilities. This puts them in tune with the cultural material that they are to transmit, and their attitude is taken over by the child as he gradually develops self- and social-consciousness. Then, as soon as he is old enough, the boy, who is to be given the greater training for social life, accompanies his elders as they carry on their dairly pursuits, visits with his parents at the assemblies, and listens to discussions that impress him even though they are beyond his understanding.

Within the home the entire family attempts to guide the conduct of the child, even going so far as to produce artificial emotional shocks that they may deepen the attention of the learner. Games that mimic the activities of the parents and develop rivalry are encouraged. Specific techniques, together with the magical regulations that are related to them, are taught to both the boys and the girls.[8] In such training, commitment to the idea or sentiment is the more easily accomplished because emotional attitudes are reactions fundamentally related to body changes.[9] These attitudes, as they take shape as personality possessions, are products of social experience in the widest sense, not traits that spring into being as the result of some specific, separate occurrence. They represent instead a growth process, accumulative in character; they take form from a period rather than from a moment of functioning. They come forth from the whole environmental experience and are specific expressions of the total personality.[10]

[8] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, pp. 175-178.

[9] Buford J. Johnson, *Child Psychology*, p. 340.

[10] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, chap. VIII.

The significance of the family in this process comes from this fact, that the emotional habit is a product of reaction, of sensitivity to suggestions given by parents, and of a reflex of activities engineered also by the parents. If the environment provides a high degree of consistency of cultural background, the child assimilates its several notions and sentiments in a way that gives him emotional security. This in turn insures the continuance of the social institution as the child, its potential sustainer, becomes an active, dependable recruit.

The child's attention to persons and his intercourse with them make possible his entrance into institutions. These are presented to him as concepts, ideas of going concerns, but the causal impressions that bring the child into institutional alignment are something that he gets through the medium of persons. Whatever is said to him in a formal way, whatever notions are conveyed of the meaning of institutions, his understanding of them for the most part is a reflection of his parents' reactions to them. Thus the child gathers most of the meaning he attaches to state, church, the social code, and the like. He certainly does not always echo parental attitudes; nevertheless, the substantial contact given him with an institution comes not from words, not from commands or preachments, but from the child's detection of the sentiments of his elders, who become themselves the medium of his interpretation. Later, when he becomes conscious of an original, direct, personal attitude toward institutions, a division of sentiment may result. In modern life this appears frequently in the child's reaction to church and to school. He knows his parents' feeling toward these and their expectation that he will duplicate their sentiments. This he cannot accomplish when he finds himself driven by stronger feelings toward contrary attitudes, and when his acquiescence is made the test of loyalty, emotional conflict follows.

The parent leads the child to the institution and then the institution takes over. The emotional meaning that it comes to have in the career of the child depends upon what comes out of this interaction of child and institution. The action and

reaction contacts between the two are never simple, since neither is consistent, firmly formed; on the contrary, each is continuously changing. The institution is no more a homogeneity than is the growing child himself. The institution carries a great composite of tradition, elements of which are in sharp disagreement; it functions through a group of individuals who, however harmonious they may be in their institutional loyalty, are nevertheless sharply marked by personality differences—dissimilarities which do not disappear from the impressions received by the child.

Any society that permits the individual to emerge and maintain his self-expression encourages the shuffling off of the earliest family-given institutional sentiments. As a result the institution is forced to win the allegiance of the maturing child a second time and on a different basis. The consequence of this is that the institution has to take account of the reactions of those whose support is needed for its survival. It is, of course, during youth that risk of repudiation of earlier attitudes toward institutions is greatest. The recognition of this fact forces institutional leadership to maintain a better adaption to existing social circumstances than would be the case if the institution were not challenged. There is, however, always a fundamental lag which is inherent in the structure of the social organization. Adults are in control and are strongly driven to maintain their accustomed practices. They surrender authority and direction only so far as they are driven by the necessity of not alienating youth and thereby losing an indispensable support.

Institutional leadership seeks the support of parents in the hope that this will bring youth into a more submissive or at least receptive attitude. This enlistment is favored by the fact that there is a greater nearness of age and sympathy between those who direct institutions and the adult members of the family than there is between parents and children. This alliance, however, frequently leads to tension within the family group, and not seldom to a hostility toward and a repudiation, if that be possible, of the institution. The child reacts as if he

were conscious of exploitation. He resents the fact that the institution for its own purposes has tried to make use of his affection for his parents. Here, for example, is the explanation of the turning away from religious organizations of some of those who in childhood have been coerced by the influence the institution has had over their parents.

In the long run, it would prove better for the prosperity and security of any institution if its leadership were obliged to go directly to the child, especially to the adolescent, in order to win his allegiance. This would force upon the adults in command a greater effort to adapt and would lessen the gap between the generations. The tendency, however, is for the institution to keep to its adult pattern, seeking to fashion youth rather than recognizing its own need of change in order to adapt to the circumstances that youth represent.

It would be too much to say that the family practice is deliberate and self-conscious in the way it seems when subjected to sociological analysis, but this does not alter the fact that the process of social transmission has become the function of a social institution developed through an accumulation of sentiment and method gathered from human experience. The process is so inherently a part of the survival adaption of the group, even in the most simple civilizations, that it is easy to forget that it was a new achievement in the earliest stages of human evolution, an acquirement indispensable to the survival of culture itself. The family gives perpetuity to existing social institutions, because it carries on a survival function now just as it did in the prehistoric passage of man from animal limitations into the resources of a socially transmitted culture.

IX. *The Family Support of Government and Public Opinion*

GOVERNMENT AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION. The term "government" catalogues many institutions diverse in constituency and motive, all having, however, a common function —that of regulating behavior. The word "government" is commonly used as a synonym for political government, the most complex of these authority-giving organizations, and the discussion in this chapter is limited to this narrower concept. Highly developed as is the modern political state, its function is analogous to the physiological correlation which permits integration in the most rudimentary types of organic life through a behavior pattern which recognizes dominance and subordination.[1] In some subhuman groups we have more elaborate systems of control that are most impressively suggestive of the political experience of human beings.[2]

Political government comes from the necessity of maintaining order in a group of individuals. Its absence means anarchy, a condition of such disturbance and insecurity that no group of persons can tolerate it. This does not, of course, mean that the members of a group always have a clear understanding of the need of some overhead control, but rather that their self-interest, their desire for peace among themselves, as well as protection from the aggressions of those outside, lead irresistibly to some sort of order-giving authority. This fact permits controversy among those searching for the origin of the state, since even before there is anything that corresponds to our modern

[1] Charles M. Child, *Physiological Foundations of Behavior*, chap. IV.
[2] W. M. Wheeler, *Social Life Among the Insects.*

political organization, there is of necessity general recognition of some kind of authority.

The rise of the type of organization that in the modern sense we can designate as political is favored by the existence of other social institutions. These also need to be regulated and supported by a system of public order. Naturally, among these institutions none is more significant in this respect than the family. Since it is the most imperative of the various human relationships that establish an integration of social individuals through patterns of behavior that maintain order, it has been a favorite choice as a source of origin of the principle of political government. It is not necessary to assume that the state came from the enlargement of the family to do justice to the significant contribution the family at all stages of social evolution among human beings has made to the building of a system of group control.

Primitive government

There is an immense quantity of literature that attempts to describe and interpret primitive government. It reveals not only great diversity in the forms of group-given authority but also in the strength and maturity of political organizations. Our interest in this great variety of human experience is limited to the relationship between primitive government and the family. From this angle the principle of kinship is most significant. This binding together by ties of blood provides opportunity for group control that necessarily carries beyond the domain of the individual family. Within this grouping the individual family, by the mere fact of its existence, not only serves as an example of a social pattern maintaining order and correlating dominance and subordination but also, as it functions, emphasizes the need of a social organization that can knit together in common purpose many families in somewhat the same way that the different members of an individual family are brought into unity.

It does not follow, therefore, that it is necessary in order to recognize the significance of the family as a contributor to political organization among primitive people to conceive of government as a mere expansion of the kinship principle. What is necessary is that the collection of persons living together and having common interests arising from their social relationships take over some pattern of social control. The political state became possible by the development among a group of persons of the same principle of order and authority which we find in the individual family, but this does not mean that political endeavor could only come into being by an enlarging of the family. What was necessary was that, whether bound by blood ties or associated by mere proximity, members of a group make possible an orderly relationship by responding to some scheme of regulation, thus on a larger scale practicing a principle of behavior characteristically present in the family.

Kinship provides opportunity for leadership, indeed, enforces its coming, in the group whose members develop the sense of belonging together, just as it does in the narrower confines of the individual family. We have already discussed in a former chapter how loose and transitory this group acceptance of leadership and authority may be. Fleeting as it is, however, it reveals the root from which political authority springs. As the group takes on more and more of the characteristics of a formal political institution, it moves away from the notion of a common kinship toward the idea of relationship based upon nationality. Always, however, whatever the political composition, there is need of regulation through the establishment of authority which, whatever its expression, is in its essential function of maintaining order similar to the situation that comes into being in the most loosely constructed individual family.

This does not mean that there is a deliberate, rational planning of a program of authority because the group members generally recognize how indispensable this is as a survival asset. Instead of this self-conscious effort to build social regu-

lations, there grows, as a result of expediency, as a product of the natural tendency within the group to recognize leadership and to accept it, a scheme of government that represents a realistic outcome of the fact of dominance and subordination among those living together. This, also, is not unlike what happens within the individual family as it carries on spontaneously and is not hardened into a traditional legalistic pattern such as in theory was created by the Roman law.

The essence of government is social control in its broadest sense. It is this definition that one must keep in mind in talking about primitive government. Every society, to maintain existence, has to develop a general system of regulations. This becomes a formal institution, but in simple societies there may be little of the concentration of authority characteristic of highly developed governments. Instead, the regulations may be so tied up with specialized activities as to yield little of the superstructure of administration and sovereignty so characteristic of government with us as to seem its necessary accompaniment. Peoples living on the lowest political plane have no such formal organization,[3] but this does not mean that there is no regulating code and no means of administering it. Among the Andamanese, described by Lowie, we find the elders because of their personal prestige occupying the position of authority and enforcing the regulations curbing the individual. Violations of the group-approved customs bring popular disapproval.

It might seem that such simple social life would offer no opportunity for the recognition of individual differences and achievement on the part of those especially gifted with the qualities of leadership and the power of controlling others which we associate with formal government. On the contrary, it is possible to be distinguished, but the distinction has to be a natural one arising from some special gift or strength of character expressed in ways that attract the attention and win the appreciation of others in activities of group concern. These

[3] Robert H. Lowie, *The Origin of the State*, p. 4.

men, and sometimes women, that rise above their fellows are those constituting what Mead has called "the fixed minds in the social system."[4] This leadership, although effective, is not based on a conscious, deliberate delegation of power but on a response to prestige through recognition of personal qualities,[5] an influence of personality frequently illustrated in the spontaneous informal groupings of college students, or in the street youth's gang.

It is important for the understanding of the family as it supports public order to keep in mind that in primitive society we do not have the lodgment of authority so essential to our own public order. The dominance of the big man, for example, may not be stationary but may rise or fall according to the circumstances. The natural leader may take prominence on the hunting or the fishing expedition, his influence resting upon the fact that he has already demonstrated his skill. The undertaking ended, his authority may disappear. Likewise, war may bring forth a different leader whose power will continue only so long as the strife which puts a premium upon his ability.[6] The hidden man may be given command in a rabbit hunt while on other occasions he may be without any special influence. Even the seasons may influence this personality type of authority. Lowie gives as an example of this the Shivwits.[7] Part of the year this tribe would break up into distinct families, each claiming the right to a spring and the seeds growing beside it, while in the winter they united to form one hunting band.

The family's contribution to primitive government

An analysis of the embryonic governments of primitive peoples emphasizes the significance of the family in the building and maintaining of social authority. Sumner has defined the

[4] Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament*, p. 186.
[5] A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *The Andaman Islanders*, p. 45.
[6] W. G. Sumner and A. G. Keller, *The Science of Society*, vol. 1, p. 475.
[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

state as nothing more than the final adjustment in a series which starts in the family and goes forward through clan and tribe.[8] Whatever speculation may yield as to the political evolution ending in the modern concept of State, the closeness to the family pattern of the formal organizations that develop in primitive society maintaining order, administering justice, and establishing social unity is evident. It is equally clear that the routine of everyday life, gathering about the household, supports these organizations and maintains them by influences handed down from parent to child. The growth of the formal political institution is by no means a regular orderly evolution, a mere enlargement of blood ties, starting with the family and ending in the State; but, nevertheless, the family at every stage of political development contributes enormously to the existing group-wide systems of public order.

Since the days of Maine, political science has recognized the difference in government functions in societies based upon kinship and those based upon territory.[9] One of the interesting questions that has engaged the political science specialist has been the competition of the blood tie organization with the local or territory organization.[10] Lowie holds that the kin group does not regulate marriage merely because of blood ties but also in part because it exists as a local group.[11] Again he tells us of tribes in which the kin and the territorial group coincide.[12] In such instances the influence of the family upon the organization of government has a clear passage.

Even now in isolated rural communities it is possible to find groups of families closely knit together by intermarriage, and the emergence of prestige and authority as the various family members gather about the person who has, by general consent, been given social leadership. Not many years past the author became familiar with such spontaneous headship of re-

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 702.
[9] A. M. Tozzer, *Social Origins and Social Continuities*, p. 199.
[10] Lowie, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

lated families in a hamlet in one of the northeastern states. In this community there were two such superstructures of social prestige, resting upon two different sets of intertwined individual families. Between them there was a constant feud as each sought to capture the political positions that administered the local governmental control. Undoubtedly the influences that bound together each group of families were both blood ties and closeness of contact in the same locality. It was evident that the clannish feeling, so strong in the territory they occupied, lost its intensity among those who removed to other communities, even though they still maintained their family connections.

The basis of governmental control

Any attempt to uncover the basis of the control of formal and governmental organizations enforces the fact that the fundamental motivation is again that of survival. The group supports regulating systems because they are necessary for the preservation of order and the maintenance of values. This, of course, does not indicate necessarily a development of foresight, essential to a reasoning process, but only a recognition and selection of what proves to be expedient. The formal organization registers the effects of experience in the group practices that carry on common interest and encourage group solidarity. This fact explains why so much of the actual social control in simple society seems outside any formal organization and attached to various routines, that is, taking shape in folkways and mores rather than in laws and administrative systems.

It is the notion, the principle of social control, that yields the institution of government, but as a result of a growth process rather than of any clear-cut political organization. It is, however, this underlying disposition that reveals the part the family has in the support of government. The family administers the sentiment that insures public order. It works as an organization for group maintenance along the line that produces the political

evolution just as it does along the line which leads to the Church. It provides government in embryo; it also reflects the authorities that are above itself. It operates under no set scheme, and its contribution follows no regular progress. Always group-minded in its own processes, it constitutes a sort of deputy governmental organization.

Government, once it ceases to be simple and spontaneous, moves rapidly toward some formal organization whose authority is accepted because it seems an intrinsic condition of social life, a situation into which one literally enters by birth. Always, however concealed, the principle of group-approved authority persists, and when there is a conscious widespread withholding of this acceptance of control, revolution and a new establishment of authority are not far away.

It is the extension of the family principle rather than enlargement of the family itself that provides the support of the political formal institution. It is the acceptance of conditions that make for order, the growth of regulations, and the increasing concentration of the power and obligation to enforce these, that build the structure of government out of the primitive need of peace and security which in turn demands some workable method of handling dominance and subordination.

If human nature preferred an anarchistic state of relationships, it would be driven from its choice by the pressure of unfortunate circumstances. Order is not merely desirable; it is indispensable. Without it, survival is impossible. Indeed, the principle of social orderliness through regulation and authority may be stretched so as to spread through all formal institutions that have or are supposed to have survival value. This means that in the church, the school, the industrial organization, the labor union, there is an aspect of that function of group discipline that is the essential characteristic feature of what we now know as the State. In primitive life, however, it is difficult to separate the various organizations that regulate the life of the individuals because they are so interrelated as they function, while what we select as nearest to our concept of government

does not have the specialty, the distinctness, or even the continuity that characterizes the modern, complex state. That which functions in primitive society in ways most suggestive of our political organization is closer to our family experience than to our highly developed modern state.

The family and maintenance of authority

The family is a universal social organization. We find it in some form in every society of which we have knowledge. Its existence is so axiomatic that we are prone to set it by itself, disregarding its extra significance even in the simplest cultural situation. The domestic clustering of those who are tied together by real or fictitious kindredness has meaning beyond the household. This is hidden by any classification of the social life that leads to the separation of the activities of a people into compartments. The contribution of the family in government is minimized by a thinking that constructs barriers between the various aspects of a total social experience.

When the functioning family is properly placed within the wholeness of the social life of a primitive group, it becomes a stock pattern of behavior that recognizes and responds to authority. It carries on through a persistent and, for the most part, spontaneous scheme of relationship and activities which is a necessary condition for the existence of the household. There may be in any individual family little or great orderliness, faint or strong dominance of authority, or there may be a changing from the one to the other which easily leads the modern investigator to misinterpret the characteristics of the family organization because of the way he happens to see it. Nevertheless, there is always the underlying pattern of behavior without which the family would be a mere collection of persons and not an absolutely universal institution.[13]

These practices are not a product of native impulses, but are brought by the pressure of circumstances. We have no reason

[13] Robert H. Lowie, *Primitive Society*, p. 147.

to suppose that there is ever absent a potential disorder, even among the families of the simplest people of which we have knowledge. The domestic pattern perpetuates itself so consistently by the processes of primitive education that there may be an acceptance of authority in such a matter of fact way that the possible anarchistic disruptions would never reach social consciousness. This, however, is an indication of the strength of the domestic patterns, and not evidence that there is anything among human beings that corresponds to the instincts that furnish animals with a relationship that approaches the human family.

The maintenance of authority is a cultural product even if its ongoing appears a native demand of human nature. The conflicts that in our time become open and troublesome in family relationships so frequently as to seem a characteristic feature of the modern home are clearly latent among people who do not carry the burden of a highly developed culture.[14] This problem-making feature of the modern family will be discussed later. The fact that students of the family need to keep in mind is that without the domestic pattern of authority and subordination the family could not function in primitive society.

The underlying mood of domestic intimacies is always among preliterate people that of adjustments made possible by a program of authority and submission. It is in the child-parent relationship especially that this shows itself. It is, however, also expressed in the maintenance of roles, not merely of husband and wife but of each relative within the household in his relationship to every other. These distinctions and placements carry privilege and responsibility, self-denial, and prestige. They are sometimes loosely drawn but usually they are precise and commanding.

The authority of the family is not characteristically that exercised by a fixed, all-inclusive sovereign, although to the outsider familiar with a different culture there often seems to be

[14] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, chap. XII.

a domestic dictatorship. This misconception comes from not realizing that the various roles within the household carry prerogatives. The power of the head of the family may be very great, but nevertheless each member role, although it is one of subordination, also carries certain privileges that are as well supported by the culture as the supreme authority itself.

The inclusiveness of the domestic pattern lessens the risk of arbitrary power on the part of him who has the authority of headship. Because of this, the family goes farther than merely giving an example in simple form of the adjustment necessary for unity and orderliness. The family also gains experience in the distribution of responsibility and maintains an authority which not only is supported by social approval but also protects the individual by registering the status of each member with varying degrees of dominance and inferiority. The incest taboo, for example, illustrates the limitation placed upon each household member by means of a strongly enforced system of regulation.[15] In *Coming of Age in Samoa*,[16] Margaret Mead has given us an introduction to the intricacies of household intimacy, stressing the status of the child. Even the newborn infant assumes a role. Each member of the family has duties to the others. Indeed, she defines a relative as one who has the right to make a multitude of demands and who in turn has placed upon him a quantity of obligations.[17]

There are, of course, great differences in the assortment and the definiteness of domestic roles. Primitive behavior tends to maintain, by a consistent cultural pressure, a clarity in assigning status that is not present in the modern home. We do see in modern life, however, domestic anarchy that comes from a conflict of cultures that breaks down role-determination within the individual family. Many examples of this appear in the Polish peasant.[18]

[15] W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior*, chap. VII.
[16] Chap. IV.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[18] W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, vol. 2, chap. II.

The family trains as it functions

The meaning of the contribution of the family in the social order as expressed in government activities may be minimized by assuming that training received within the household has to be self-conscious and deliberate. Except in the case of children, there is little of such purposeful effort in primitive family life either to maintain or interpret family roles or to justify authority. The discussions, conflicts, and adjustments so characteristic of our present modern family are replaced by a complacent acceptance of the status assigned. The training, therefore, that the family contributes to public order must be found in its matter-of-course activities, authorities, and responsibilities. It is possible to exaggerate this domestic orderliness, as we now realize from recent anthropological literature; but, nevertheless, primitive behavior within the household does generally proceed according to the cultural schedule.[19]

The contribution the family makes to the political life is a by-product of its normal domestic functioning. This, of course, is still true of the modern family, as is brought out by the well-established proverb that example counts more than precept. Nevertheless, the modern family needs consciously to look beyond itself if the child is to have preparedness for his future obligations as a citizen. The primitive family, on the contrary, can accomplish a greater quantity of this social discipline without conscious effort, because the child coming into a home environment where regulation is well established and all roles are well marked readily takes over in the process of growth, through his familial contacts, the attitude which permits him later as an adult to accept authority and obligation. Again it is an exaggeration to assume that this acceptance of culture meets with no recoil, but such troubles are looked upon as domestic problems and dealt with as such, even though they may have to do with the interests of group welfare or the observing of the folkways.

[19] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, chap. IV.

Domestic relationships vs. political relationships

The family, by providing a segregated unit of interest, nourishes the attitude necessary in the larger commonweal. It is in this sense that the family can be thought of as the nucleus of society. The intimacies as well as the purposes of the household demand not only a sense of relationship but the acceptance of a scheme of regulations on a wider scale. Interactions of people bound together by the ties of clan, of tribe, or nation, also require a program that makes for order and unity. If the family came first in time, the experiences it provided served as a simple elemental education for the spirit of relationships, acceptance of authority, and submission on a wider scale. This extension of order, of course, spreads in many directions, only one of which can properly be charted as the development of the political aspect. Nevertheless, from the beginning the loosest form of political organization profited from the orderliness that was carried on within the domestic circle.

The formal governmental functions could not come from the mere collecting together of individuals. There had to be in addition some sense of relationship, some degree of the spirit of kinship, which was an essential feature of family life. Even where there is a multiplicity of organizations, there is still lacking the basis of anything that can function so as to insure political unity, unless there is this attitude of union which so spontaneously appears in the family because domestic intimacy both encourages and demands its coming. Mere associational activity by itself, as Lowie states, is not sufficient to weld people together politically.[20] There must be the addition of the feeling of oneness which appears in every form of family life of which we now have knowledge. This explains the domestic readjustment that increasingly becomes necessary as Western civilization makes its impact upon the Chinese large family. As the sense of national unity increases there has to be a lessening

[20] Robert H. Lowie, *The Origin of the State*, p. 11.

of the almost monopolistic control of loyalty previously characteristic of the Chinese family pattern.

The family and public order

There are social pressures continuously operating to force human nature toward government, and at any moment they may, because of untoward circumstances, become aggressively coercive. These incitements to the maintenance of social order may from their objectives be divided into two classes, one keeping peace within the group and the other protecting it from external dangers. It is obvious that any influence making for group unity in the handling of these two sets of problems becomes a social advantage in the struggle for survival.

The group inwardly divided had little security, and the conditions of simple society impressed this lesson upon human nature in a way that rarely happens to the thinking of modern men and women. Peace within meant more than the mere avoidance of conflict. It had positive significance. There was, just as there still is, need of co-operation, but this, without some force that could keep down the proneness of the individual to go his own way, then as now broke down in practice. Often food-producing activities required the working together of many adults. It was necessary not only to have the social pressure that would enlist this group to work together, but once it gathered the fruits of its labor, it was also needful that there be an authorized scheme of dividing the food material accumulated.

Then there was another type of problem that had to be solved, the assignment of duties. The role of the individual in simple society frequently seems to the observer so rigidly established as to destroy the freedom that we believe necessary for progress. It was more necessary to the savage that he did not go backward than that he went forward. Even if this attitude held up variation, it was an advantage under the circumstances that each person be given definite placement and a clear,

socially imposed status and role. Although it is easy to exaggerate the placing of the individual, the general trend was unmistakably toward the emphasis of social stability. One of the most important and decisive of these was the definition of male and female roles, a subject that deserves later special discussion.

The function of justice was included in the governing processes. This meant determining the rights of the individual, his privileges in his relations with others; and this for the most part came, as was customary in the family, in the form of commands with prohibitions. The command, "Thou shalt not steal," for example, was in its positive expression assurance that one had a right to his own possessions. Likewise, the command, "Thou shalt not kill," promised that the group would attempt to maintain the individual's right to live.[21]

There was also the necessity of the group's working together to protect itself. This was not confined to war, although fear of the enemy was a powerful motive for the enforcement of public order. Usually hazards had their source in the environment. Even when there were no dangers from wild animals, from floods, winds, thunderstorms, fire, and the like, there were subjectively created menaces coming from the spirit land, from magic, and from unfavorable omens. It mattered not that these were born of the imagination; they were equally effective in providing pressure toward an effective social order. These menaces frequently appeared in concert, so that the natives were driven, as it were, to protect themselves against one inclusive enemy that ranged over the entire territory of fact and imagination.

The family came into this primarily through its support of sanctions. The institution itself was interrelated with the complete system of public control, and most significant to us is the fact that coercion and regulation, group incentives to co-operate, were backed up by the family as a functioning institution.

[21] Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 629.

Although there was, as a rule, no deliberate assignment of authority, no voting of power, governmental authority nevertheless had its being in the sanctions given it by the group members. The family was a clustering point where the individual was committed to the welfare of the group. This does not mean that all authority was derived and was brought forth from human nature by influences of family association. There were other loyalties, one of which directly belonged to that general welfare which now we would denote the State. Nevertheless, it was in the ordinary familial intimacies that the members of the home were prepared to feel and accept, in the same manner and spirit that they subscribed to household order, the greater authority of the group itself.

We are too apt to think of this association as it strengthened the sentiments, without which there could be no public order, as something made possible by blood ties. Lowie rightly insists, as we have already noticed, that the contiguity element must be taken into account.[22] In other words, it was the living together of the members of the family that not only made the institution but brought forth the ideas and feelings that in turn became the support of other group interests. We know that this is true in our own time and that it explains the necessity of converting the family in any permanent social reconstruction. The less complex setting of savage people would enhance rather than lessen this contribution of the family toward the support of the social code and embryonic governmental activities.

We gain further insight into the power of the family by remembering that this group control was accepted not piecemeal but as a one-pattern reaction. At least this was the characteristic behavior of the family. In minor matters outside the folkways and the mores the individual was left free to his own choices, and the family merely illustrated the differences of attitude and of behavior. This, however, was because such matters fell outside the area where group control was exercised.

[22] *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

With regard to the more significant sphere of conduct, social pressure led the family to act as a whole and to accept as a whole the regulating system.

The institution of government did not stand by itself but was tied up with the institution of religion and with every other social development. It is the investigator who for purposes of analysis separates the social life the native lives as a whole into its specialties. It follows that the family could hardly accept itself and carry on its normal functions without automatically taking over the other control traits that were characteristic of the life of the people at that time and place. The family, for example, could not observe the religious rites and accept the concepts of the spirit of magic and every phase of supernatural belief without taking on the regulative system that constituted the division of interest that we place in the category of government. To go contrary to the group code would mean breaking with the religious organization, so thoroughly were they bound together. Thus the ties of the family, with each special clustering point of social values, tended to make it support the others. The family did not need to add special obligations as goals of endeavor but merely carried on its normal activities, and these required so much recognition of interests that had to do with other institutions that its self-maintaining activities strengthened the other social institutions, especially the one that constituted public order.

The family and public opinion

Public opinion is the inevitable consequence of people living together. It is not something that has to be produced. It accompanies any sort of social interaction, because it is an attempt to express, even when it is vague and inarticulate, feelings of common interest. This explains its large emotional content. Sumner thinks of it as being very nearly the elemental force in social evolution.[23] If public opinion merely recorded the sentiments

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 730.

generated by the intermingling of people, this would not be true. Its significance as force comes from its coercive element. No sooner does it shape itself in any degree than it begins to operate to enforce conformity. It establishes the social standards, the proprieties, both in the sphere of feeling and of action.

If it seems too generous to give public opinion supremacy as a social force, in accord with Sumner's thinking, there can be no doubt about its basic importance in every form of institution of government. Here at least it is an elemental force. Circumstances often tend to hinder this and, indeed, alien governments maintained by force provide temporary exceptions, but controlling authorities, surveyed broadly and over a considerable period of time, reveal as their foundation public opinion.

When we examine public opinion to find its origin and its renewal, we find ourselves dealing with the simple, coercive processes that flourish within the family. Praise, blame, ridicule, are prominent, and they act in the life of the group just as they do in the family, but on a larger scale. This explains the inevitableness of public opinion. The reactions that make it are potentially present as soon as self-consciousness awakens. One cannot be with others and have awareness of them without simultaneously reacting to their mental states and interpreting them as they have meaning for one's own self-consciousness. Communication, once it is possible, becomes the means by which this reaction of one person to another is turned into attitudes, ideas, or activities, singly or in association, that embody and protect common interest. In our present political experience this is so complex as to forbid adequate explanation and analysis, unless it is broken into particular items and made concrete.

The process as a public-opinion interaction escapes this abstraction when we seek its operation within the family. There the process itself appears naturally in intermittent expressions of praise, blame, and ridicule. Censure carries over to the infliction of penalties, and we see punishment in varying degree made use of to enforce the authority that has established itself within the family. This does not mean, however, that one finds always

in the family life of simple people a clear-cut code of discipline. The testimony of the traveler and the investigator is quite to the contrary. Frequently we are told that the child in its early years receives no moral training at all, not even rebukes.[24] Even if this is true, the public opinion process indirectly is at work.

Desire to imitate, to obtain recognition, comes from self-consciousness and presses toward approved behavior even when formal praise or blame is not expressed by older members of the family. In other words, the primitive family, in spite of its differences, in its giving of elemental training to the child is similar to our own. There is less variability than we find in our own culture, where we have families ranging from the strictest discipline to the greatest indifference or indulgence; but in the building of awareness of the attitudes and reactions of other members, both families perform a socializing function, and this occurs automatically because the motivating influences are inherent in the contact of the family members.

Gregarious fellowship brings forth public opinion. Any welding together of individuals, even though it be very slight, leads to recognition of common interest, and, as a consequence, to the development of approved conduct. Were this not true, members of the group would remain in an anarchistic isolation. In other words, what changes a mere collection into a society is a recognition of common needs which, as soon as it crystallizes, becomes pressure to which these actions of each must respond or penalties follow. This becomes a social organization, not necessarily through any self-conscious direction but as a mere by-product of the living together of individuals. Perhaps the best illustration of this at present is found in the group-originated developments of leadership standards and approvals that appear spontaneously when a number of children gather together in play. Even if there were no sense of special relationship, no notion of blood ties, and no feelings of affection, the association of adults and children in individual homes would

[24] John Roscoe, *The Baganda, Their Customs and Beliefs*, p. 59.

bring as a by-product the incentives to regulation that constitute the foundation of the formal institution of government.

The family an ally of social control

There are incentives to approve conduct, suggestions that lead to imitations and reactions showing approval and disapproval, that arise when people in association feel in some measure unity—what Giddings emphasized as "consciousness of kind." The family merely offers favorable circumstances, the incentives that drive human nature toward the formal organization of government. The only escape open to the individual from this pressure, which is both suppression and incitement, is a spirit of no attention to others, a program not only contrary to the human disposition but one that, if carried into effect quickly, brings on an attack from the group. In the child there are no resources adequate for protection from this group coercion. In primitive society, likewise, the individual has no choice. If he alienates the group and is ostracized, he is thrown into peril without any means of protection. In either case, great deviation from the standard pattern of behavior indicates not superior intelligence but lack of normal endowment of mind.

So long as the family keeps upon its simple plane and does not import the mechanisms of pride and egoistic self-consciousness associated with a highly competitive, sophisticated, complex civilization, instead of lodgment of emotions within the self and the gathering of satisfaction from being different and independent, the opposite is true, and failure of the individual to do the expected thing, even to come up to others, brings feelings of shame. This is a self-imposed penalty which reveals how greatly each person is susceptible to the influences of the group. It is an effective ally of social control and is still potent not only in the experience of the modern child but also in the career of the average adult.

An analysis of public opinion discloses sanctions based upon feelings of value as the underlying purpose of the system of

regulations. The recognition of values is not always direct, simple, and near the surface, nor even consistent; but it is, nevertheless, the final purpose, and when the sense of value disappears, the institution that has existed to establish or protect this likewise passes. Tradition, mere automatic social habit, may prevent its immediate death, but this merely means that the appeal the institution has had does not, as a rule, depart at once but gradually, through an increasing neglect. This is the drift which Sumner describes as characteristic of the degeneration of the mores.[25] The system of control may be so contrary to human interest as to constitute a social vice, but even so, there are sanctions still present, only they concern a matter that has become contrary to the social well-being of the people rather than absent. This situation can easily be found in the home life that holds for the child fictitious ideals or persists in clinging to faulty and anachronistic teachings and preachments.

The child furnishes the most favorable personality for the value-giving processes. Although particular items in the regulating systems may irk him, gain his protest, or remain for the moment unassimilated, for the most part he welcomes this conformity-producing group product of social control. He takes it in first through the medium of the family and later from out-of-the-home associations. In the latter, however, are sure to be expressions of the earlier, more fundamental, familial contact.

The family's judicial function

Especially is it necessary to observe the function of the family as an elemental, judicial institution. Many interests cluster about the notion of justice, and there are, as a consequence, many developments that constitute social institutions. The elemental idea of preserving peace between persons and assigning to each his rights and privileges is so bound up with the normal operation of the family that it may deservedly be given a prominent

[25] Sumner and Keller, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

place in the functioning of the family. In spite of the complexity of the legal system in highly developed society, this fundamental principle, embodied in both the laws and the courts, shows itself clearly in simple form not only in the primitive family but also in any orthodox, modern type of family life.

There cannot be group solidarity, even effective co-operation, if each individual attempts to administer the rights he claims and is insensitive to the pressure of the group as it tries to define the roles, the possessions, and the privileges of each member. The family enforces this necessity of judicial processes, a by-product of its solidarity.[26] The modern parent easily appreciates the judicial element that in some measure seems an essential characteristic of the family. He is called upon constantly to act the part of judge; he also serves the child as an elemental lawmaker. There are many reasons to suppose that even now what may be thought of as the child's judicial disposition is laid down in early years under the influence of home surroundings. The rebel, the nonconformist, is created by influences generated within the home more than by anything that comes later.

Primitive society, however, could not permit such great variation as a consequence of parental suggestion and teaching, since it would mean disaster to the entire family to create in the child the unsocial and antisocial incitements that modern psychiatric science lays bare as the explanation of the demagogue and rebel. The justice rendered as a matter of course during the trivial occurrences of family life not only needed to be enforced but driven to an acceptance, for protest of any sort represented, at least in minute form, the spirit of rebellion disastrous to the family as well as to the larger sphere of discipline taken over by the institution of government.

The family and the state

Although the state is difficult to define, because any attempt at description must recognize the system of legal or political

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 629.

philosophy in which it is placed, it represents in the modern vocabulary, whatever turn it takes, the most formal expression of the social interests and trends which we have marked off as political. Its present attainment reveals a development that has gone a long distance from the simple features characteristic of primitive society. Throughout this long-distance development, the family and the state have maintained social interaction. The latter has taken on with its maturity a much more formal aspect than has the family, a natural consequence of the intimate, personal, and, as we say, private, experiences within the family which naturally block the structural spread open to man's political interest. This tends to create the feeling of distance between the two institutions as a result of the difference in both the quality and the quantity of their function.

The modern state maintains a twofold relationship with the family. It gains support from and gives support to the domestic institution. Family deterioration registers quickly in political life, appearing in loss of integrity in both citizenship and governmental activities. A great part of the functioning of the state influences the family and often is directly concerned with domestic matters. In the modern Western world we have various trends in the relation of the nation and the family, but their main movement appears in the increase of the State and the lessening of family independence and authority. Sometimes the laws are pointed directly at the family, as is especially illustrated by recent Japanese legislation. As a consequence of the interaction of nation and family, we have competition between the two institutions in which the family has increasingly lost authority, self-determination, and even function.

The most impressive illustration of this in our own civilization has been the encroachment of the school and the surrendering to it by the family of much of the control that it once enjoyed over the child. For example, the author, in order that he might educate his two older children in the way that seemed best, had to be registered and certified as a private school in order to meet the requirements of the law while resident in one

of the New England States. This would not have been possible had it not been for the confidence, interest, and sympathy of the State Department of Public Education in the experiment. A generation earlier the mother of these same children received from her parents similar training without any legal difficulty whatsoever. In one generation, educational self-determination had been entirely lost by the family through statutory enactments.

The Church also, without the assistance of the law, has likewise taken over functions that earlier were carried on by the family. The control of the State as it enters the territory once belonging to the domestic institution has, however, a different meaning, because with it goes a power unpossessed by other institutions. But there is a leaning on the part of many parents toward a parasitic acceptance of the services of the state, which makes the invasion an acceptance of their invitation rather than an assault upon the home. On the whole, however, vigorous family life, even in the modern world, resists the tendency toward the encroachment of the state; and the extension of political control, although unmistakable, is not continuous or consistent chiefly because the family as it functions within its privacy preserves individuality, a barrier even to the power of totalitarian governments.

X. *The Family Support of Education*

EDUCATION, A SOCIAL NECESSITY. The recognition of the special necessity of education is co-extensive with modern culture. No supporting practice of present civilization is more obvious. This is best illustrated by the firm control of the educational system exercised by aggressive states.

Since human culture is not enforced by instinct, it has to be maintained by some sort of inculcation which permits the experiences of one generation to be imparted during infancy and childhood to those who later are to be the carriers of the social system. Education in some form, therefore, cannot be absent in any social groups, for this would mean to the groups the loss of their members' support, the cultural resources of survival. We do not, however, find among the simpler peoples anything that corresponds to the institution of the school. Instead, the family carries on in a very simple way a great portion of the teaching of children and youth. The nature of this instruction is better brought out by the term "conditioning" than by anything that suggests the practices of the modern school. It is meager in content, spasmodic in operation, and so faintly distributed as to seem insignificant. The moment, however, that the observer tests the solidarity of the group, he realizes the effectiveness of this seemingly unsystematic, irresponsible program for the training of the young.

The observer who has become familiar with the social practices of any group of primitive people realizes how misleading may be the conception of the casual visitor accustomed to the formal teaching of the modern state. He discovers, also, that as a rule certain parts of the educational process are extremely definite and are firmly embedded in social routine. These

conditioning, teaching processes do not stand out apart, as is true of instruction of the school and college in modern civilization, but are maintained as a part of the ordinary practices of people. This is especially true of the contribution made by the family. If it is examined to find anything characteristic of our type of school teaching, it cannot be counted as an educational agency. If, however, it is looked at to discover when and how the parent imparts to the child the information and attitudes that constitute the basic cultural training, the conclusion is different. The mere fact of social continuity from generation to generation demonstrates the success with which the family carries on a great part of the training for life which perpetuates the culture.

The primitive philosophy of life enforces these educational processes even though they operate as an undistinguishable part of the family routine. The belief in magic which a simple, uncritical culture encourages becomes a powerful incentive for the social conditioning which the persistency of culture demands. Indeed, the folkways in all their expressions give massive support to the natural disposition of the parent to impart to the child his own knowledge and concepts. The highly organized modern state and the simplest primitive group, if culture is possessed—and in no human society can it be absent—are equally dependent upon training processes that are in fact education. The distinction is in form and in quantity. The basic educating process itself as a means of cultural defence is present in both. The meagerness of the one and the elaborateness of the other does not mean that the actual educating practices are insignificant in one and important only in the other.

As culture develops and its resources accumulate, the educating activities necessarily become more socially conscious, and, as a consequence, the school as a fundamental social institution emerges and takes over responsibilty for the greater part of what to us is counted as education. This tends not only to make us discount the inculcating processes among the

simpler people but also to make us forget the fundamental part in the training of the child which is still possessed by the modern family, even though its field of activity is greatly narrowed by the aggressiveness of the school as a social institution.

The family and primitive education

Any attempt to get back to the simpler social situation, where education for life comes as a by-product, for the most part, of the ordinary routine of life, means rehearsing the operation of family influences previously discussed. We can go, however, into the primitive home to try to find the teaching process, to abstract it from its content and describe it as a process foreshadowing what has now become formal and institutionalized. There is no standard pattern, but we discover that certain principles are common. For example, the child in simple society is apt to be largely free to shift for himself. He is rarely guided or corrected; he is left so much to himself that it is not possible to find much evidence of the early schooling that we would consider imperative.[1] The primitive home is apt to seem remarkably free from discipline. Here is an explanation of the recoil such children have when they are removed from their family life into any sort of school.[2] Even moral training in the modern sense seems frequently to be absent from the home.[3]

If, however, such a policy is interpreted as perfect indifference to the training of the child, it quickly appears that this is an exaggeration of an easygoing attitude that draws the attention of the modern adult. In contrast, we soon discover that at a later time the child is treated from our viewpoint overharshly. Roscoe testifies that petty theft and disobedience are sometimes punished by burning the child's hand or even

[1] Nathan Miller, *The Child in Primitive Society*, p. 133.
[2] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, p. 67.
[3] John Roscoe, *The Baganda, Their Customs and Beliefs*, p. 67.

cutting off his ear. Thus the same author who stresses the freedom of the native child tells us that punishments are often in excess of the faults committed.[4] This is especially true when the father or mother becomes angry.

Another principle in primitive education, as it is carried on in the family, is the frequency with which the child is permitted to learn from experience. He is left to himself, but his circumstances force him to learn.[5] This program teaches the child to observe what he sees, and as a result of his association with his elders he picks up what otherwise he would have to be taught in a formal manner. Naturally, this process is prominent in his family relationships. Imitation and play also encourage the fashioning of the social disposition. The child tries to make utensils like those possessed by his elders. He seeks to act as they do.[6] The inspection of any genuine household in our own time discloses how effective these efforts on the part of the child are in building his earliest social desires and habits.

Superficially it is easy to get the impression that in simple society there is little of what we call education. This judgment is fallacious because it does not recognize the efficacy of the environmental contact of children in such a society. Their direct approach to environment, their recognition in very early years of the tyranny of circumstances that force adjustment, is such as to be a most effective tutor, operating first in the emotional intimacy of parent and child. Children still show how easily and deeply this attracts them and wins their sympathy, for it is not uncommon to find the modern child in rebellion against formal education, but captivated wholeheartedly by the opportunities offered him in a camp, even though his environmental contacts are not nearly as forceful as those that characteristically are experienced by the children of primitive society.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[5] Miller, *op. cit.*
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

Primitive education through nurture

The physical care the family has to give the child during his period of helplessness also provides training which from the start is directed toward social goals. This double service of the parent gets recognition in the word "nurture," which carries the idea of providing both means of physical growth and training. Thus the family has given to it control of educating processes that are first in time and apparently first in emotional significance.

During the historic period there have been some attempts, and oftener, agitations, looking toward the giving of this elementary education to some organization other than the family. Experience has shown that such a transference is difficult and contrary to native human impulses, and when the experiment is tried the child has to have, for his normal development, however provided, relationships that are essentially a duplication of what naturally happens in the ordinary family. In this providing of relationships there is no radical difference between the primitive and the modern family. Both, as a rule, take over the care of the infant, and in this nurture socialization gradually appears in an increasing degree.

This does not necessarily mean that the family adopts a conscious, deliberate program by which it seeks to make the child a well-adapted member of the community. It matters not whether there is this insight or not; the family in any case seeks to bring the child in accord with its own purposes. It maneuvers as it meets the needs of the child to bring him into adjustment with the family circle. The mere placing of the child in a family setting leads irresistibly toward a relationship in which the interests of the family influence the training the child receives. The family, however, in its effort to bring the child into accord with itself, is carried beyond its own limits, since the institution cannot be indifferent to its own social situation, and this in turn impels it, in whatever training it gives the child, to include recognition of the wider

values of the community. This means that the education the family necessarily provides the child carries beyond the family.

As a consequence of its concern, the primitive family, as is true of the modern family, furnishes the child with a nurture in which his interests, the interests of the family, and the interests of the community are so intertwined that any attempt to separate these threefold functions appears arbitrary. Analysis seeks to break up into various categories what in fact comes to the child as a unity and is therefore all the more effective in conditioning his personality. The interplay of the desires of the child, the wishes of the parents, and the demands of the community, constitute the drama of domestic experience. Modern life merely makes the process more conscious and the three motivations more clearly defined.

When we seek the value of the training contributions of the primitive family, therefore, we must look to its ordinary activities rather than to some specialized type of instruction. The family does not annex any of the formal education that is now so socially prominent because of the development of the school. Instead it meets the physical necessities of the child, but in a way increasingly to impress upon him modes of behavior that permit him to fit into the family and into the community.

In the primitive family, once the child has safely traveled out of infancy, he shares, according to the social code, the activities of the parent in such a way as to be gaining constant preparation for his responsibilities as an adult, especially in his means of livelihood. Anthropological studies of specific primitive groups show us an educational continuity that permits the child in early years to begin to move toward this necessary preparation for social life. For example, the Manus child of the Admiralty Islands, north of New Guinea, is taught merely to understand the house, to understand the fire, to understand the canoe, and to understand the sea.[7] Each of these represents a

[7] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, p. 34.

line of training that is meant to insure the welfare of the family and the social maturity of the child. The first two naturally come first, but they all are learned rapidly, for the child between four and six years of age has mastered each of them.

Primitive curriculum

There is no standard training program to be found among primitive people. The nurture the child receives in the family has great variations. This should not seem surprising since it is true even in our own highly organized society. The wide differences in the family routine that one finds as he passes from one cultural group to another tempts the superficial observer to give one type of family credit for training the child and to indict another as negligent. For example, we are told that among the Baganda the children are not brought up to observe habits of cleanliness but develop more like an animal than a human being.[8] In contrast with this, Malinowski reports that among the natives of the Trobriand Islands, in British New Guinea, the children are taught to observe strict cleanliness, and one who becomes careless is not infrequently put to shame by his parents.[9] It would be possible to find opposite statements similar to these about almost any feature of parental training.

There is, however, one obvious fact which is impressive. Neglect cannot go too far or the child's life is endangered. Any constant practice of such indifference would in time necessarily bring about the extinction of the group. In other words, there is a necessary minimum of attention which survival requires, and this cannot be given without having in some degree a training process. However, the critic of the primitive family is likely to let his subjective reactions lead him to underrate the significance of what the family does in preparing the child for later life. Absolute neglect again would operate

[8] Roscoe, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
[9] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. 2, p. 446.

to undermine the cultural security of the group. Children are not brought up as animals, for their social plane of living never sinks so low. Even if the community has a more effective program than the family for giving this necessary preparedness for later life, the child's earliest period is not utterly void of socializing influences, and the work of the community presupposes the prior activity of the family and its continued support of whatever education the group provides for bringing the child safely to adulthood. The observer is likely to minimize what the family does because it is so casual, so associated with ordinary routine, and to overvalue other primitive agencies of education because they are more suggestive of the school system which to the modern person seems the educational standard.[10]

The family as a conditioning agency

The best way to measure the influence of the family as an educational agency is to take some particular line of development where we find normal impulses given a social fashioning. This process must not be thought of merely in terms of parent and child, but rather of the household taken as a whole. Sometimes, for example, we find older children playing most important roles in the development of those younger.[11] There is no need to go back to Joseph Lancaster's experiment with the "monitorial system" to learn that this influence of child upon child is still effective, because we find in the modern home demonstration of its power. In our society, however, it has hazards that were absent or at least slight amid conditions of simpler culture, and the dangers loom large in the literature of mental hygiene.

Food offers one of the best illustrations of the way the family conditions the child and brings even a physical appetite under

[10] *See* A. J. Todd, *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency*, chap. VIII.

[11] Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, p. 24.

the dominance of social custom and tradition. There is so much that gathers about the eating of food that it is not an exaggeration to speak of these customs as constituting a food cult.[12] In other words, the mere taking of nourishment provides a motive for the development of social institutions. Eating may come to be regarded as so significant, even though there be no knowledge of its physiological importance, that it is considered somewhat dangerous, an act that will not be carried out in a strange village and only in a limited manner in public even within the same community.[13]

Eating also may be related to the belief in spirits, and it may be a custom to prepare for the dead portions of food which it is assumed will gratify the ghosts. An expression of this is placing food at a burial place or before a monument and then later eating it.[14]

One of the most common attitudes of primitive people toward the taking of food is the placing of restrictions upon it. One of the most frequent illustrations of this is the individual's being prohibited from eating a plant or an animal, the name of which he bears as his totem.[15] These food taboos take many forms. A custom among the Jakun, the denial to parents of the right to eat certain fish and animals until their children are able to walk,[16] may be taken as an example of this.

Crawley tells us that every man and woman on the Andaman Islands is prohibited throughout life from eating some one or more fish or animal. This is because in childhood the food was imagined by the mother to be the cause of some functional trouble. When the child is old enough, the reason for the taboo is explained and thereafter he avoids it.[17] The prevalence of food superstitions among some pregnant women, even to

[12] Raymond Firth, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, p. 159.
[13] Malinowski, *op. cit.*, p. 441.
[14] Robert W. Williamson, *The Ways of the South Sea Savage*, p. 74.
[15] B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 467.
[16] W. W. Skeat and C. O. Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, p. 21.
[17] Ernest Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, pp. 154–155.

this day, leads us not to be surprised to find that among primitive people pregnancy and childbirth are occasions for restrictions based upon the belief that if one eats the prohibited foods evil consequences will follow.[18] This teaching of food taboos is so thoroughly ingrained in the thinking of the individual from childhood that even an accidental violation, so it is reported, will instill fear that may even cause death. For example, the report is made of a boy, perfectly strong and healthy, who became ill when it was discovered that he had eaten some female 'possum before he was permitted to have it. He became ill and, after continuing so for three weeks, he died.[19] Then there is the idea that the food has such a relationship with an individual who has partaken of it that if any part of it falls into the hands of an enemy it can be used to bring evil. The aborigines of Queensland, for example, were careful always to burn any food that was left over from a meal,[20] because of this risk.

It is, of course, not true that all of the teaching that has to do with food regulations is carried on within the family. The community provides both suggestion and authority. For the most part, nevertheless, these notions concerning food taboos and food customs are transmitted in family contact by parents who feel the strongest motives not only to observe the regulations, themselves, but to see that their offspring also follow the beaten path. The modern family passes on its own food likes and dislikes, food choices that are characteristic of the social group, as the goulash in Hungary and pie in the American pie belt, and the interesting phenomena of table etiquette and the various rituals of food consumption.

The family curriculum

The primitive child enters a society that is of necessity harsh and exacting. Never is the native far from the consciousness

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 417-418.
[19] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of Southeast Australia*, p. 770.
[20] Crawley, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

of the need of struggle to live. Even the body of the child must be disciplined or his survival is dubious. Some environments are more severe than others, but the savage is never cradled in luxury. The child in early years is hardened in body, and sometimes what seems to be neglect by the family is rather a positive effort to build in the child the necessary stamina for his survival, even though doing this brings physical hazard. We are told, for instance, that the Greenland Eskimos have ten distinguishable exercises that are made use of to prepare the children for their life as adults.[21]

Anthropological literature abounds with illustrations of hardening and weathering methods carried on in accord with the demands of climate, that are motivated in the desire to equip the child for his later life. Many of the most ostentatious of these, especially when carried on in adolescence, are in the hands of tribal or community authorities. Even in these the parents or the relatives of the family may have a part. There is, however, a great quantity of more casual habit-forming that has the same purpose, that is maintained by the family; and if this is disregarded, a significant function belonging to the home as an educational agency is concealed. This discipline takes a different form for boys and for girls, but neither sex is given freedom from practices designed to enable them not only to meet the necessary hardships of the environment but also to be equal to the demands placed upon them by the prevailing division of labor.

Vocational training

The primitive family has work to do, and the child must take his share of the burden just as soon as he is strong enough to be of any practical assistance. The quantity of child labor varies with environmental and cultural circumstances. The child himself has the impulse to join in the activities of the elders, and in the beginning much that he does is in the spirit

[21] Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

of play. Thus the boy takes part when he is old enough in the hunting or fishing activities of the father, and the girl assists the mother in work that the culture turns over to women. The parent naturally encourages such voluntary efforts of the child and gradually increases the guidance and advice that are necessary to make what the child attempts an advantage to the family rather than a hindrance. The child has to be taught to handle weapons, to use tools, to carry on the routines that are looked upon as effective by the mother or father. Along with this goes an incentive on the part of the child to win the praise of the parent.

This training has all the greater significance because it is so frequently associated with formulas impregnated with magical meaning embedded in the folkways. The child learns not only the skills required, but also the beliefs and attitudes that are in themselves a socializing influence in bringing him into greater accord with the prevailing culture. This mode of instruction seems far distant from that characteristic of modern public education, but it is one of the misfortunes of the latter that such should be true. Even yet, the most effective early training the child receives in the family is developed in the same spirit of co-working of child and parent which environmental pressure enforces in the life of primitive peoples.

In our own time we recognize the superior opportunity that the rural family possesses as compared with that of the city in that it can to some extent make possible the zestful working of the child with the parent. There was, however, in the primitive family a stern necessity that forced it to assume during the child's earliest years a training process that was a large part of the education for life rather than something, as may be true in our present-day rural situation, that is outrivaled by the task assumed in the schools. It also must be remembered that the struggle for survival in primitive society gave meaning to the acquiring of vocational skill and made possible prestige, and, as a consequence, the parent then as now

was likely to take a natural pride in the achievements of his child.[22]

Moral and spiritual guidance

When the modern student surveys the training program of the primitive family, he distinguishes the activities directed toward the means of livelihood from those that are akin to our ethical and religious instruction. Although this classification is logical, it must be remembered that there was no such division in the feeling and thinking of the savage. The child was led toward conformity to the approved patterns of conduct in the belief that these were an important part of physical as well as social security. For example, if the culture placed stress upon behavior of the child in its magical consequences, a situation which did not always prevail,[23] it followed that the parents must assume responsibility over the child's doings for their own protection. If they were to permit the children to be unrestrained, their policy, because of its magical hazards, would invite disaster, bringing risk not only to themselves as a household but also to the larger group life to which they belonged. Even if the fears of parents were unavailing in leading them to have serious regard for what the child might do to incur the hostility of the spirits, the pressure of the social group would be felt in a way that would make such a lax policy costly to those who attempted to pursue it.

It was the natural thing for the parent in teaching any skill to add the instruction that would make it possible for the child, as he hunted, fished, or planted, to act in accord with the prevailing notions of magic. This side of the preparation for life was considered as important as the other because they were both, to the mind of the native, necessary for success. Any program for vocational training that left out the rites,

[22] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines*, chap. VIII.

[23] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, p. 109.

the taboos, and the doctrines of magic was unthinkable. If the child received one kind of instruction, he was also given the other.

Saturated as is the life of the primitive parent with belief in magic and the constancy of spirit phenomena, it would be difficult for him, even if he tried, not to bring to the child suggestions that prove highly conditioning. As a rule, however, the parent is seriously concerned with implanting in the mind of the child the notions that have such significance to the adult. Even the infant is introduced to parental practices that are in the nature of pantomime and that are supposed to bring a desired end through magical powers. Though these may have no immediate meaning for the child, they become impressive as he develops and are soon given added social significance as self-consciousness appears.

There is, of course, great variation between cultures as to the importance given the child's behavior in the orthodox adult interpretation of spiritual phenomena. There are also, as a consequence, differences in the reaction of children. Sometimes they are shut out of the adult world of magic.[24] In the case of the Manus people, the children regard the magical performances of their parents as annoyances. On the other hand, there is abundant testimony in anthropological literature that the being left out—and this applies to women and squaw men as well as children—makes the rites and pantomimes that they are not permitted to share all the more impressive.

Malinowski bears testimony that even small children among the native Trobriands begin to understand and follow tribal traditions and customs and to accept the taboos.[25] This conformity, which is much more pronounced in the behavior of older children, reveals best the efficacy of parental teaching. The rigidity of moral and spiritual concepts cannot be credited to family instruction exclusively, since as the child develops

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[25] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. 1, p. 53.

there are community influences that work toward the same purpose, but in this effective program the family naturally has the first responsibility, and its part is basic.

Primitive parents also attempt consciously to direct their child's career in the same manner as the conscientious modern father or mother. For example, the Pima father was accustomed to hold the small child in his arms at sunrise and tell him about the mysteries of the great Sun God.

> As he grew too big to be held in arms, he had to sit up very straight and pay strict attention while his father lectured to him on the proper conduct of a Pima warrior and citizen; or, in other words, soldier and gentleman. If he was not fully awake and paid indifferent heed to what was told him the father's stiffened middle finger would suddenly strike the side of his nose, bringing his face around until he looked straight into his father's eyes.[26]

Another common and effective way of building social habits and attitudes in the life of the child was by the use of folklore. Although this, of course, was not confined to the family and frequently had an emphasis in connection with initiation rites that it had at no other time, it was common for the primitive family to introduce the child to such material as early as he could be impressed by it. This folklore was presented in forms that interested the child, stories of travel experience and fables that enforced the ideas that made for group welfare. The following example from the Ibo people's folklore is representative of the use that is made of animal stories to impress children:

> One day a rat saw some fish and, being of a covetous disposition, he immediately planned to steal them. In his eagerness he did not observe that the fish were in a trap and, consequently, he himself was caught. He cried out to the trap, "Why are you treating me in this manner? I know of no cause of quarrel between us."

[26] Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

"Oh," replied the trap, "it is because you came to steal what was in my possession and so I caught you also."

Moral: To steal other people's goods leads to the punishment of the thief.[27]

The primitive parent's greatest concern is to bring his child into good adjustment to the spiritual forces that are supposed to determine his successes and his misfortunes. The great number of observances necessary to keep the spirits favorably disposed is carried on by various members of the family and necessarily penetrates the developing consciousness of the child and establishes strong emotional habits. The large place fear occupies during the child's formative years furnishes a favorable setting for the religious teaching of the parent, whether by precept or example. This comes out when attention is given to the belief in ghosts and the effect that this has upon the practices of primitive people. The ritual that accompanies belief in ghosts and spirits[28] builds in the child a susceptibility to the influence of parent and elder that not only leads him to take over the spiritual system of his time and place but also provides incentive for socialization along other lines. Sometimes the family situation itself becomes religiously a conditioning influence. The Manus reflected in their attitude toward the spirits the feelings of the child for his father and of the latter toward his children.[29] This same transference is not uncommon in the religious concepts of historic peoples.

The family as the educating institution

It requires arbitrary selection to draw together the miscellany of family influences that can be labeled education, since maintenance of every institution so directly rested upon

[27] Basden, *op. cit.*, pp. 273-274.
[28] Williamson, *op. cit.*, pp. 73–85.
[29] Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea*, p. 109.

the work of the family as an educational agency that there seems to have been no place for such specialized instruction as we now associate with the school. While this is true, it is necessary, in order to give the family full credit for its social contribution, to remember that it did contain within itself from the beginning the motives and the processes that have now grown to great proportion in the formal institutions of education from the kindergarten through the universities to adult instruction.

Although the child of today is ordinarily far removed from sharp contact with physical nature as experienced by primitive children, it is well for the student of the family to remember that the home setting is still the first environment with which the child in our time normally has self-conscious contact. The modern parent has great command over the circumstances of the child's life and may easily provide a situation which uses to the full the artificial resources of present civilization.

This ability to manipulate does not change the fact that the child's first experiences in life are a few, necessarily simple, awarenesses of an environment that he cannot receive as anything complicated, since his own elemental equipment forces him to limit acquaintance to mere fragments of the totality that has been placed about him. As a consequence, his first learning processes are not only meager in content, however great their prophecy, but are carried on under conditions that still give the family the first place in the basic emotional education for life. Much that happens is independent of family purposes, products of underlying organic incentives, but always in this primary process that ushers in the growth that eventually establishes personality, the family has a greater strategic influence, especially in the direction of emotions, than any later program provided by the formal educating institutions.

The primitive family did not serve as a school, in our modern sense of the term, any more than does the ordinary contemporary home. Instruction was not systematic, nor did

it have any specific organization. The parent did not think of himself as assuming from time to time unusual prerogatives in acting the part of the teacher. Nevertheless, he taught, and just as all the formal institutions depended upon this instruction for their continued existence, the root was being nourished from which in time sprang forth the specific formal institution of education, our most massive organization for social control.

The school as a formal institution

Perhaps nothing shows how far we have moved from the simple life of primitive people better than the elaborate mechanism for social direction now assigned to the school, the college, and the university. These institutions, although they function and accept the same task of preparing the child and youth for adjustment to the physical and social environment, have little in common with the natural spontaneous methods of instruction that were by-products of the life together of primitive parents and children. The ordinary home still continues in some degree the kind of training that was once almost all that was given in preparation for the adult career. Formal education, however, has broken away from its one-time simplicity, and to a very great extent functions to preserve the interests that the institutions have developed as they attempt to distribute to oncoming members of society as much as possible of the vast resources that now constitute our culture and to help the individual adequately to live his life in an exacting, complex environment. Always the perpetuation of the educating institution itself intrudes in its processes of training, giving the clearest of all illustrations of the way the institution, once it becomes formal, operates to insure its own survival and growth.

As a consequence of this specialization, the school appears at a great distance from the home, to the teacher, to the parents, and to the child. Indeed, the gulf is so great that special effort is made to bridge it and to bring teacher and

parents into some sort of working alliance. This, in fact, generally means that the parents' interest and sympathy are cultivated by those who administer the school program, that it may have the support from parents necessary for its financial and social security. Formal education has now become so independent and important in our social scheme that it gives little suggestion of its place of origin, the home. There have been many attempts in the history of education to fashion the school in accord with family experience and give it a home atmosphere, notably by Pestalozzi, Lancaster, Robert Owen, and most recently, Henrietta Johnson. The orthodox program is built upon the dominance of the formal institution, and this makes it difficult for the child, trained in the spirit of the home, whether by tutors or by some deliberate effort to imitate home conditions, to enter, as he eventually must, the standardized, artificial program.

Family training a functional aspect

In both the primitive and the modern family the training processes that influence the child are a functional aspect of the ordinary activities of the household. Occasionally coming close to the more formal instruction of the schools, they for the most part are in spirit, in content, and in method very unlike formal schooling. We can only give right credit to the family for its contribution as an educational agency by recognizing that the purpose of the school becomes in the home a by-product of a more variegated routine. Indeed, imitation of school practices, even in the modern home, is not only out of character with its spirit but less effective.

The naturalness and intimacy of parent and child association is at a great distance from any systematic formal instruction, but it is meaningful in emotional responses on both sides and thus has entrance to the deepest level of character formation. What is true in the relationships of the modern home is all the more significant for those living on the level of primitive

culture. Teaching there has to be in the sense that the child must have training for life, and this becomes in greatest measure a task of the family. As culture develops, the community enlarges its part in the process and establishes the school to carry on as a distinct social institution. The family, however, normally keeps to itself most of the training given to the very young child and supports by sympathy and interest, as well as by taxation, the more elaborate institutional instruction. This inevitable progress moves away from a program of training processes that are inherent in the relationship of child and parent to one that always carries the hazard of seeming to the child arbitrary and artificial. Thus the school goals take on a value irrespective of their meaning to the child in his everyday personality responses to the totality of his environment, with the consequence that formal instruction becomes a compartment-type of experience, something that registers little in his emotions, even at times becoming fundamentally alienating. Because of this the family has a responsibility to maintain itself as a source of instruction even when the children have access to well-organized, progressive schools.

The child's reality

The reality the child possesses is of changing character. It normally follows through different states.[30] Piaget tells us that the child moves from realism to objectivity, from realism to reciprocity, and from realism to relativity. The first permits him to distinguish between what is external, open to the observation of others, and what belongs to him and is unknown by others. Through reciprocity he gains knowledge of the fact that his values are recognized by others as well as by himself. The third achievement leads him to realize that no quality of character within his mind is an independent substance or attribute. The development of the child carries him from a time when he has no realization of the difference between the

[30] Jean Piaget, *The Child's Conception of Physical Causation*, p. 201.

"I" and the external world to a period of an increasing appreciation of the meaning of objectivity and subjectivity. A second line of progress appears as the child learns the necessity of interpreting his perceptions. Piaget illustrates the third line of development by the reconstruction of the idea of movement by the child as he comes to recognize that not all moving things move in the same way or because of the same force. This is but one example of the many radical reconstructions that occur in the intellectual growth of the child and that are open to the influence of the parent because the advance so largely occurs during the early years of childhood.

What happens indicates clearly the way domestic education proceeds and its importance. The parent seldom in a formal way attempts to influence the child's notion of reality. This sometimes occurs, and perhaps most often on account of the questions of the child. For the most part, however, the instruction that penetrates the child's mind is a natural by-product of household interactions.

The child breaks up his world into the objective and the subjective because so much happens in his family experience that forces him gradually to distinguish the two types of reality. A similar gradual attainment through family contacts leads the child to an appreciation of reciprocity. He is forced through his associations to accept the fact that others see things differently from the way he does, until gradually he acquires the notion that reality is not something immediately gained but a construction which does justice to all points of view by stressing that which is common. There are few parents who are not made conscious, through the child's numerous questions, of the way he acquires his idea of relativity. His idea of similarity between things which the adult finds different is broken down by numerous concrete experiences and explanations.

The parent, wearied by the child's continuous questioning, may regard himself as a martyr to curiosity rather than as an instructor providing the mind of his offspring with indispen-

sable means of intellectual growth. The interest of the parent in the child not only invites the confidence which is indispensable in this informative interaction but also tends to give the parent the patience and sympathy which this elemental teaching requires. It does not follow that the parent can safely be trusted with full responsibility since there is a very important contribution that the nursery school, through its larger social contacts, can more naturally provide, but it is true that the family normally assumes teaching processes that lay the basis of intellectual development, the foundation upon which a more formal type of education later functions.

Education for family life

As stated in a later chapter, Rousseau, the French philosopher, contributed to thought about marriage and the family chiefly through his discussion of the meaning of childhood. It is true that his doctrine of equality, the most characteristic and dynamic of his preachments, was created from his own personal experience and suffering.[31] The realization of the meaning of this necessarily brought forward another idea, also a product of personal experience; namely, that the child had need of authority.[32] Both of these insights, which may seem contradictory, but are, rather, complementary, were open to discovery by anyone who was capable of making a thoroughgoing exploration of the emotional content of his own childhood.

These two conceptions have profound pedagogic significance in that they emphasize the value of recognizing the child's necessity for both self-expression and social direction. Thus interpreted, they are basic in the most modern and scientific of educational practices. In spite of the influence they have had, however, schools still hesitate to gain either their insight or their method of procedure from the same source from which Rousseau drew his principles.

[31] Otto Rank, *Modern Education*, p. 12.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Until the significance of this failure to build school practices on the inwardness of the child's developing personality is recognized, educational policy can never contribute much to the welfare of the family. Indeed, on the contrary, much of its influence will be adverse unless educators are both willing and prepared to find within the child's incentives the goals both of curricula and of educational practices rather than using these as resources to induce him to acquire for entirely different purposes requirements prescribed by adult prejudice. One process explores childhood and accepts its biologic and social interpretation in the fashioning of a program of training for life; the other exploits the child's endowments in the effort to get him to assimilate values which the institutions in control of education have established. The self-expression that the latter provides is chiefly a means of getting the child to feel some sense of freedom as he does what the school and college demand of him. This represents pedagogical skill on the part of the instructor who gives the child satisfactions beyond that of fulfilling requirements, but it does not lead the educator to appreciate the purpose of childhood or youth; nor does it make it easy for the individual to build from within the feeling of freedom and security that should come to him through intellectual development. An example of this coercion is the conventional attempt to control the child's taste in reading in the effort to have him accept what adults, librarians, teachers of literature, and especially those who draw up school requirements, think good for him. The effect of this on most children is to force their self-chosen reading into other channels, such as "funnies," comics, and "big-little books." The school's eagerness to force the child makes its influence sterile as it labors to control the natural, inwardly developed love of reading, which alone opens the door to literary appreciation.

The social waste that comes from this failure, not so much to study the child as to accept the child, appears when one thinks of the present neglect of education for family life. The words "instruction for family life" are almost certain to

bring to the mind of the reader the need of establishing specific courses such as are now commonly found in both our colleges and high schools. Valuable as these are, they cannot, standing by themselves, give the child or youth the family preparation that the best interests of both the individual and society require. Fitness for parenthood can only feebly be carried forward by such specific formal programs. Instead, preparedness for family living needs to be a continuous development coming forth from the interests and incentives of the child as they are offered for the use of the educator at different periods of development.

The efficient home takes advantage in early years of the child's questions, reactions, and desires that can be constructively used to build in him favorable and understanding attitudes toward family experience. As soon, however, as the child goes to school and the parent surrenders in great measure both the time and opportunity needed to give him a systematic and mature appreciation of the meaning of family life, the continuity of this essential preparation is broken, even, in fact, antagonized. The only responsibility that the school ordinarily assumes is eventually to offer a didactic, specific course in family relationships which, under the circumstances, enlists the interests of the child more than one has the right to expect. Nevertheless, there have been empty years, and in that time the gathering of impressions detrimental to successful family life, false ideas, emotional obstructions, and, most unfortunate of all, neglect of interests of the child that could have been used to carry on the maturing of a domestic disposition. These losses indicate how far those who direct the educational program are from a realization of the meaning of childhood as an opportunity for the growth of the basic interests of society. Instead of looking to the inner life of the child in its biologic as well as its intellectual and social propensities for growth in order to build a program for the maturing of a wholesome life-philosophy—the Greek's meaning of wisdom—social maturity is expected to come from the inculcating of factual knowledge.

One illustration indicating how far this estrangement in the educational program has gone from the natural conditions provided for a child's development is the unwillingness of school administrators to allow the married woman and mother to teach, and the reasons given for such a prohibition. We are told that the married woman does not fit so smoothly into the teacher's task as does the unmarried woman, an argument that is not advanced concerning the married man. In so far as this is true, it uncovers how fundamentally estranged our present school practices are from the spirit of the family, which should provide the ideal for any educational program for a child. We are also more commonly told that it is unfair to the unmarried woman that she should have competition from married women in public school-teaching, especially since each year a new and large group graduates and comes forth from normal school and college seeking employment as teachers. It would be difficult in any way to say more clearly that it is not the interests of the child but the interests of some adults who can make use of the child for personal advantage that are paramount.

The mischief of this policy has been pointed out again and again. The unmarried woman, especially as the years gather, has a problem that comes from her giving up what society has established as the normal condition for the fulfilling of biologic and psychic incentives of the human endowment. This abnormal experience adds to the difficulty of her own self-adjustment, which in turn creates the possibility of many life-reactions that cannot but hamper her value as a teacher of developing children and youth, especially in matters that concern domesticity. It is true that she may sublimate by a vicarious parenthood, but experience demonstrates that this is not so safe or conducive to objective appreciation of child nature as is genuine parenthood. Or she may react with feelings of deprivation, loneliness, and inferiority, and because of this unwittingly urge her pupils away from their natural advance toward the maturity that includes love, marriage, and parenthood. Probably in no way have such restless and

unhappy persons the power to be so harmful, both intellectually and emotionally, as when they teach courses in marriage and parental education. It does not follow that only married women should be allowed to teach in our schools or in family courses, but rather that the price of teaching should not be for women an external, arbitrarily enforced celibacy.

If society ever honestly and effectively seeks to conserve the family through education it will insist that the woman has the same right as the man to marry while teaching. Whether the instructor is married or not, educational procedure should have regard from the first year for the child's development in preparedness for domestic life by allowing adequate opportunity for his increasing emotional maturity and insight. This should be considered one of the chief functions of public education, without which it cannot be defended as an organization for social welfare.

Sex education

Sex affords a most impressive example of the need of a continuous educational development which utilizes during the various periods of growth the impulses of the child. The sexual aspects of human conduct are not peculiar in needing a socially directed development. They stand out in this respect merely because they are still so differently treated from other forms of human behavior that have great social significance. The briefest exploration of human sex experience discloses that there can be no satisfactory preparation for adult sex life that is merely intellectual. The enrichment that has come forth from the socializing of an instinct that, in its simpler form, is so common in higher animal life, has given an emotional content that cannot be ignored in any life-training program.

However valuable definite sex instruction may be at any period from early childhood to late adolescence, and however given, whether by the parents or by a specially trained educator, it must prove disappointing unless it is reinforced by the influ-

ences of emotional attitudes that are best started early and within the family. This does not mean that there is not need of more than the family ordinarily can give, especially at adolescence, nor that it is not an advantage to have the presentation freed from the subjective meaning it ordinarily has when tied up with the parent-child relationship, but it does mean that mere fact-giving teaching is not sufficient.

What the child requires is revealed as soon as we pay attention to the expressions of sex interest that successively appear. The determining influence that more than anything else will give or deny to him a sex education adequate to meet his needs will be the attitude he gathers during his formative period. This seeking for sex knowledge, whether it comes spontaneously or is the product of suggestions from the environment, is to him, until he has been adversely conditioned, nothing different from other seeking on his part for greater knowledge. His interest arises in connection with thinking originating from the activity of his mind in the same way that other ideas gain momentum, or as a result of impressions coming from something that has attracted his attention from the outside. In either case, sex is not detached from the running movement of his mental life but is merely an episode of interest which he takes for granted unless he has been taught by experience to the contrary through having his expressions of curiosity, desire, or activity in connection with sex dealt with by his parents or anyone else differently from other such expressions.

This explains the impossibility of attempting to keep the child's sex life void until at a definite day and hour he has reached the maturity that is assumed to be the proper time for didactic instruction. The child reveals the necessity of seizing an opportunity when his interest creates one, rather than seeking to foist upon him concepts, however elemental, that the parent believes should be implanted in his life. In no aspect of the child's career is there greater need of awaiting his invitation for instruction, of keeping such contacts with him that an opening may be had, freely offered by him, for

the gaining of both emotional attitudes and such facts as his requests show he is ready to assimilate. The most consequential part of this influence upon the child naturally comes in the period in which the home happens to have dominance, especially of emotional control.

When what the child needs is withheld, various things can happen. The result will be, in any case, the building of fundamental attitudes and ideas from such impressions and information as he can gather for himself, with the important addition that sex, having created an emotional separation between him and his parents, will already have taken on a foreign element that under adult conditions may shape itself into various types of obstruction to normal sex adjustment. If the parent forcefully intrudes himself, especially if he greatly anticipates the normal development of sex interests in the child, he may cause as much trouble, even sometimes greater trouble, than if he left his offspring to his own resources.

In any case, the family has to recognize the fact that the child must always have an element of initiative even though it sometimes carries sex expression into forms and ideas against which the parent recoils. These, taken by themselves, are trivial in meaning unless they be loaded with emotional content, a misfortune resulting from some adult attitudes.

The term "sex instruction" is apt to be deceptive since it carries to many parents a narrow or physical meaning. This is a part, and an important part, of sex for the child, but it is no greater in proportion to the full content of sex in his limited experience than it is on the adult level. His concept at best is hazy, and of course there is no division between the physical and the emotional. Nevertheless, both aspects are present, and if sex is interpreted to him narrowly without emphasis upon the meaning it has in the fellowship of husband and wife, his whole idea regarding it may be distorted and hostile.

It is difficult to see how this essential element in modern sexual relationships can be conveyed naturally by anyone but a member of the family or some other adult who is himself

attached to the child by affection. It is this approach that has to be made to sex in order to give it a just portrayal to the child, and this means that it must be done by someone who is himself linked with the child by emotional ties so that this can be taken advantage of in the elemental explanations the child's curiosity requires.

The service the family naturally gives carries with it hazards. Possibly the most serious of these is the opportunity the parent has to take wishful thinking and regret back into his own childhood vicariously by using his power of control over the early life of his child. In such a case, the major idea in the mind of the parent would be to protect the child from mishaps that the adult looking backward believes to have been detrimental to his own career. This purpose, in itself commendable, easily becomes more than it seems. So many parents utilize the child's need as a means of wiping away their own feelings of guilt or in some lesser degree finding relief because of their experience as children.

There are other possible complications. The domestic counselor frequently finds an excessive sex-impelled love existing between brother and sister, sometimes having had overt expression or even continuing to have, while at other times it is an attraction, the nature of which is concealed by rationalization. Contrary to this, there may be hatred that has been created by brother-sister relationships so that there is a firmly rooted hostility to members of the opposite sex. It is most important during the growth of the child to prevent such an attitude getting tied up with the development of the sex impulse, since once it gathers momentum it is sure to draw encouragement from later experience. Hostility begets hostility, and thus there is a genuine reason for the maturing dislike, even though its existence would not have come about had there not been this start.

A more common difficulty which the literature of character analysis constantly emphasizes is that of fixation of child on parent. The healthy normal sex impulse has been overwhelmed

by the emotional meaning of the association of parent and child. The consequence is that marriage may be prevented, or it may be carried through as a means of reinvigorating the parent-child fellowship. This usually means failure, for the victim chosen as substitute fails to fulfill the expectation of the one who has married in the effort to fulfill mother love or father love.

A portion of our social thinking has of late become boastful because it has lifted the conspiracy of silence regarding sexual matters. Thus far, however, there is nothing that justifies any considerable pride. It is true that progress has been made, and that the taboo has been shaken if not broken, but there has not been the change to the positive program that is needed. The taboo had a social function even though it was inadequate and grew more so as modern life took shape. Society has not as yet widely recognized the necessity of a positive program to care for the sex development of the individual from childhood onward into marriage.

Much of the better social thinking has been forced by pressure and does not indicate the radical change of attitude that must occur before there can be any adequate understanding of the obligations of the family and of the school to the continuous, orderly, normal development of the sex interest that comes out first in very early childhood. The old supports have been removed, but the new ones have not yet been placed firmly in position. It is hopeless to expect any thoroughgoing sex education for life until there is a still greater change in the thinking of the masses regarding the function and the value of sex experience. The transition from one emotional outlook to the other cannot be made easily or without so much trouble as to encourage those unconvinced to attempt to resist the transference from taboo to intelligent recognition and control of sex life.

Until a more positive program has greater acceptance and more concrete application, present confusions must continue, and individuals must suffer the penalty of an inconsistent emo-

tional reaction to sex matters. These experiences will be used by those eager to push men and woman back to the earlier program. The impossibility of doing this with any degree of success and its incompatibility with other attitudes of modern thought will make any such effort nothing more than a slowing up of the change that is taking place. Socially, this might well be defended, because rapidity also has its penalties; but, so far as the individual is concerned, the collision of two opposite philosophies can only bring confusion, and more than one would wish of suffering.

Important as it is to recognize the sexual needs of the child and the great variety of mishaps that can come through faulty development, exaggeration may easily result by selecting the sex element from a very complex, unfortunate life-preparation and piling upon it the entire responsibility. This cannot happen unless sex is arbitrarily torn away from a great body of emotional content and made to seem the exclusive seat of injury. Any effort to build constructive sex education as a function of the family or of the school will prosper only as great care is taken not to personify the sex impulse, making it the one consequential source of personality influence. The disposition to do this is itself a reaction against the earlier period of taboo and concealment.

It is difficult to see how anyone dealing at first hand with the child rather than constructing him to fulfill interpretations of adult misfortunes can get or hold the idea that the sex impulse constitutes the determining influence over any human life. It is both cause and result, but it is always fundamentally more than this. It is an aspect woven into a wide stretch of personality experience. It deserves an important place in any program of child guidance, but even more, that it be related to other experiences and not regarded as an aspect of life that is cut away from other emotions and activities and can be dealt with as if it were and could continue to be distinct and separate from the greater content of personality development.

XI. *The Family Support of Sex Status*

MASCULINE-FEMININE STATUS. Although conventional thinking ignores the fact, the masculine-feminine status is one of the most important of our social institutions. This means that the relationship is a social habit expressing a firmly established conceptual attitude. The institution finds its structure in various concrete regulations which often appear as a portion of some other social organization. An example of this would be the separation of the sexes in public worship, a custom that has been practiced by several denominations.[1] The distribution of sex status, as it has shown itself in the practical affairs of life, tends to obscure its institutional significance. It is only when we remember that the institution is primarily a concept,[2] an abstraction, that we give it its proper place in social analysis.

Sex status is and by nature has to be a universal cultural characteristic. Minor organizations may be exclusively masculine or feminine, but such choice is never open to the race itself. It must contain males and females or die. What is biologically necessary becomes a sociological compulsion that forces not only the recognition of the two types but a code of adjustment. Life requires both male and female. Social stability demands that differences of structure be given distinct social assignments, since otherwise a cleavage of persons would result that would mean group anarchy. Nature also makes its contribution to the adjustment, for not only are the two sexes marked off from one another but each, through deep-seated pulsations, is attracted

[1] Joyce O. Hertzler, *Social Institutions*, chap. III.

[2] L. L. Bernard, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, p. 566.

to the other. This means in social practice that there are two sets of social flow, one bringing men and women together and the other tending to stress the unity of each in contrast with the other.

Even if there were not these compelling forces of biological origin that are unescapable in any sort of social experience because they are prerequisite to human survival, there would still be a clearly drawn separation of the sexes, accompanied by the double processes of attraction and repulsion. The distinction between the man and the woman is too spectacular a difference not to lead in any case to the idea of a clustering of similar traits within each sex grouping. There is no other structural difference that attracts such attention. The phenomena associated with this are impressive in all the higher forms of animal life below the human level. Moreover, given a basic difference of maleness and femaleness, the peculiarities of each would gain a social extension and a separation that is intensified by the cultural development. In any case, this is what happens as biological and sociological forces act in concert to distinguish the man and woman and at the same time recall them toward some sort of equilibrium.

One of the most forceful of these influences is the division of labor. This also rests upon unescapable biological support, but what nature gives and demands is greatly extended as it is shaped into social experience. The biological imperative becomes the social advantage, and the two are so welded together that the place where one influence ends and the other starts is so confused that controversy in the analysis of any social situation is always possible. As reproductive animals the male and female must function differently. This in turn becomes in the relationship of the two sexes a constant source of differences that are artificial in the sense that they are additions to the minimum distinction that nature enforces. We find this expressing itself clearly among people of simple culture just as is true of the most highly organized modern culture. The definiteness of the man-woman code of labor is illustrated by the following example:

Duties of Husband and Wife[3]

The Man	The Woman
(a) In building the hut.	
Cuts the trees for hut; builds it; thatches it; makes the door and bed.	Fetches the thatching grass; muds the walls and the floor.
(b) In the low ground garden (black soil).	
Cuts trees (if necessary); fences (if necessary).	Does everything else from the preliminary hoeing to the reaping.
(c) In high ground gardening.	
Cuts trees, collects and burns them; fences.	Weeds: reaps.
Both hoe (till) the ground.	
(d) General Life.	
Collects firewood; makes *mukeka* mats; makes *musansa* baskets; tends fowls; cuts men's hair; hunts and fishes; and, generally, has to do the same kind of work for his mother-in-law; has to earn money for tax and cloth, etc.	Threshes; winnows; grinds and pounds the grain; draws water; makes cookpots; makes *chilalo* mats; makes all baskets except *musansa;* makes beer; makes castor oil; cooks; sweeps; dresses husband's hair in tufts; does the washing, but can refuse if busy pounding grain, in which case the husband does it.
(e) On a journey.	
The man will carry an elder child if necessary, otherwise he carries a spear and an axe to protect the party. As the women say: "What would I do, if we met a lion and my husband were carrying a load?" In camp he makes a shelter, if necessary, and collects firewood.	The woman carries any load (cookpots, food, etc.) and the younger baby if more than one, or the only baby if an infant or toddler. The load is on her head and the child on her back or hip. In camp she cooks, draws water, etc.

[3] F. H. Melland, *In Witchbound Africa*, pp. 63-64.

The need of such a recognition does not mean that any particular system becomes established merely in the effort to have a favorable scheme for dealing with existing circumstances, for always there is a possibility of features being introduced that are insignificant accretions of the growth of folkways or actual exploitation. What we can assume is that, taken as a whole, any group-established division of labor will recognize in a social setting fundamental biological differences in a way that is favorable to survival. In the long run, any other policy would prove itself so detrimental as to incur nature's penalty of social decline and extinction.

The inclination that shows itself both on the human level and below it that leads those of the same sex to cluster together, especially the males, also contributes to the feeling of difference, at least among human beings.[4] The secret societies that are so frequently found among primitive people maintain, as a rule, sex cleavage, and undoubtedly this is one of the attractions such organizations have. More commonly found than we would expect among men, they are not, nevertheless, nonexistent among women. One of the important functions of the tribal secret society is the maintenance of the code that enforces the status of women and of men.[5]

It is interesting to notice that in American history the Grange (Patrons of Husbandry) was the first secret order to invite to its membership both men and women. In this it was reflecting the cultural trend of the American Midwest.[6]

Natural trends toward domination

As is true of all enforced relationships, the male-female association ordinarily moves toward the emphasis of one, at least in social prerogatives, and this becomes the custom enforced by the prevailing code. The evidence of history is unmistakable

[4] T. H. Van de Velde, *Sex Hostility in Marriage*, p. 15.
[5] Hutton Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies*, pp. 106-120.
[6] E. R. Groves, *The American Woman*, pp. 258-263.

as to the direction in which this change takes place. Indeed, we move out of fact into speculation the moment we assume anything other than a general trend toward masculine dominance. We do know that there are examples of female preeminence in the animal world—for example, the queen bee as contrasted with the male drone; and there are isolated cases among human beings, in which the woman has some form of social superiority over the man, as was illustrated by the Wyandots.[7] It is also held by some that the status of woman was formerly different in societies of low stages of culture where male dominance was finally established.[8]

Lester F. Ward was one who held tenaciously to the doctrine that the female sex was primary and the male secondary in the organic scheme, and that originally and normally all things centered about the female, giving her social authority. This he stated in his famous theory of gynecocracy.[9] He claimed that the ensuing dominance of the male was the result of specialization in extra-normal directions. According to his thinking, when the development of the brain reached the point where a man became conscious of his paternity and enjoyed the partnership with woman in the offspring of their loins, "he brought about the social revolution which ended in the subjection of women until they were mere slaves of the stronger sex."[10]

Anyone approaching the problem of human male and female relationships from a biological background, as did Ward, comes to his discussion with recognition of the greater reproductive role of the female and the significance nature has given her special biologic contribution. In spite of this functional preeminence, the general trend during the historic period has unquestionably been toward folkways maintaining a status of superiority for the man.

This social recognition of the male does not furnish safe

[7] J. W. Powell, *Reports of the Bureau of Ethnology*, vol. 1, pp. 59-69.
[8] Robert Briffault, *The Mothers*, vol. 1, pp. 336-343.
[9] *Pure Sociology*, pp. 296-297.
[10] *Textbook of Sociology*, p. 110.

grounds for pronouncing man the stronger sex, in the larger meaning of physical vitality. Nature's evidence is to the contrary. This is true at present in our highly organized society, as appears when we compare the life-span of males and of females. There are, of course, many explanations of the advantage of women in our mortality records, but none of them gives support to the idea that the female structure is biologically inferior to that of the male.[11] The data lead us to the contrary conclusion. This fact, however, cannot be carried over into social relations and made a basis for assuming that it is normal for woman to maintain social superiority. We have to be content with affirming that the dominance of the male is not a product of superior biologic vitality. It is best to turn aside from speculation and controversy and seek the consequences in social relationships of this difference nature has imposed between men and women in their roles as reproducers of the race. In our own time it is apparent that the greater burden has been placed upon the woman both as a potential and as an actual mother.

Masculine-feminine functioning

The radical change that occurred in the vertebrates, especially in the mammals, which permitted the offspring to be carried during a period of rapid prebirth growth within the mother's body, thus relieving her organism of the task of storing up the surplus food supply necessary in the case of lower structures, such as birds and reptiles, to give initial nourishment to the egg, permitted increased evolutionary progress. This change, however, placed responsibility upon the female as the carrier of the embryonic life, and under circumstances which associated it with the endowment of a higher intelligence, and richer emotions that make the mother-experience a source of influence that extends the distinction between the male and the female as reproducing organisms on the human level.

[11] For Life Table see *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 11, pp. 26-29. pp. 26-29.

In a way that is not true of man, the woman becomes a racial servant through her special task, the reproductive processes. The man, given greater freedom, is privileged to take advantage of this in the common social life of the two sexes. What is so obvious in our present Western civilization, in spite of the prestige and freedom given woman, must in earlier times have had even greater meaning and profoundly affected the cleavage of the two sexes, especially influencing their division of labor. This in no sense established the superiority of man as a social person, any more than it demonstrated the superiority of his organism, but it did give him the advantages due to his escape from the limitations nature imposed upon the woman, which among primitive people were magnified by highly emotional, elaborate, and magical interpretations. Social control naturally, under such circumstances, fell into the hands of the male and was gradually fashioned into folkways that became additional supports of the masculine prerogatives.

To think of this group decision as a conflict or even as a clashing of men and women means reading into the occurrence nonexistent, self-conscious motives and exaggerating the part intelligence played in the social adjustment of the two sexes. It was rather that as the female carried on her natural but more complex reproductive responsibilities, an opening was made for the male to take over social dominance. The greater muscular strength of the man made its contribution to the same end. The precariousness of the primitive person, because of his scanty cultural resources, also would encourage the leadership of the more aggressive, freer structural type. The general trend that elevated man's position was a response to circumstances that favored survival.

Realizing woman's present reproductive handicap in competition with men, it would seem more reasonable to find our explanation of the dominance of man in a natural, gradually developed division of labor between the sexes than to assume a radical revolution led by men which changed a state of culture characterized by feminine dominance to that which we find

most common in the historic era. This does not mean that there was a consistent or a universal superiority of the male in all the primitive cultural systems. For example, if the fact of the male's part in fertilization was not recognized and the placement of the child was most easily made through its relationship to the mother, the taking over of the mother's name by the child was the natural consequence.

In any case, the development leading to social distinctions between the sexes took place in that freer sphere of movement, the evolution of human society, rather than in the slower, less flexible, more limited organic adaptations, since the former furnished no rigid, narrowly controlled line of change but a growth process that was relatively plastic.[12] Instead of distinct stages we have various forms of adjustment to life-conditions, including a vast quantity of psychic notions, each of which has its own special accumulations. The total social situation in each case demands of the specific group adjustment within its own setting, and once this is recognized, variations not only in quantity but in contrasting attitudes toward men and women necessarily follow. Societies are too complex to gain direction by the selecting, eliminating processes that guide the massive lines of change in organic evolution.[13] Even so, a general expediency shows itself, and in the relationship of the two sexes this has commonly led toward the social dominance of the male.

The reproductive cycle and division of labor

The most prominent event connected with woman's reproductive career is childbirth. It was an impressive occurrence among primitive people, but it would be a grave mistake to interpret their experience in the light of that of the modern woman. The knowledge that we have of the birth process of the savage suggests that as a rule the woman of simple culture had difficult or unnatural labor less frequently than her modern

[12] Edwin G. Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, pp. 76-77.
[13] G. A. Baitsell, ed., *The Evolution of Man*, chap. V.

sister, although her advantage can be exaggerated,[14] as appears in such exceptions as the long labor of Sacajawea, and also in such liabilities as rapid aging and early death that forbid our thinking of the pregnancy and childbirth experience of primitive woman as deserving the modern woman's envy. Pregnancy had no suggestion of semi-invalidism and generally interfered little, if any, with the ordinary routine life of the primitive woman.[15] Various explanations have been given of this fact. The open-air, muscular activity—for with conception she could not withdraw from the hard struggle for existence to which each adult was expected to contribute—is believed by some to have had a favorable influence upon her pelvic arch and tended to keep flexible and elastic her ligaments and tissues.[16] It is probable also that the babies born were as a rule smaller in the far-away primitive period than at present. It is, therefore, apt to be misleading to suppose that the average primitive woman had reason to consider seriously her condition during pregnancy or that the delivery of the child constituted a serious happening in her career. The nursing of the child also seems to have been carried on as a matter of course.

Nevertheless, these two most important features of her reproductive cycles—pregnancy and birth—tended to distinguish primitive woman from the man and in some degree to encourage the division of labor between the two sexes. If the physical aspects of childbirth were less impressive than at present, the contrary was true of the magic meaning that gathered about pregnancy, childbirth, and even menstruation. There is a vast quantity of anthropological observations that show how usual it was for notions of magic to cluster about these three impressive differences between the reproductive history of the woman and the man. The nursing of the child naturally led on to the routine of nurture that began with the infant and continued until the

[14] Julius Jarcho, *Postures and Practices During Labor Among Primitive Peoples*, pp. 155-161.

[15] Phyllis M. Kaberry, *Aboriginal Woman Sacred and Profane*, p. 241.

[16] R. T. Finney, *The Story of Motherhood*, pp. 18-19.

child graduated from his mother's care. It was as natural then as now that this should be thought of as woman's specialty, thus leading inevitably to a different vocational program for the female than for the male.

The demarcation of women from men drew from various sources, expressing utilitarian purposes, but nowhere does primitive man appear to have had such a feeling of spectacular difference as in his reaction to the three most important features of the reproductive cycle of women. The relative absence of the erotic element in primitive folklore and the great attention given to woman's flowing and child-delivery suggest that these two happenings were more distinguishing than the structural difference between the male and the female. Commonly stringent taboos gathered about the menstruating woman, an attitude that not only found extreme expression in the Mosaic commandments but persists until now.[17] Some of the strictest prohibitions also had to do with sex intercourse under such circumstances as, for example, the starting out of the men on a fighting expedition, and these regulations also added to the feeling of difference between the social roles of men and women since it was the latter that by such contact brought extra hazard to the other, preparing to meet special risks.

It is in the aftermath of childbearing, the child nurture responsibilities, rather than in the event itself, that we have the greater explanation of the separation of the sexes in their social roles. Responsibility for the physical care of the human child, a necessary extension of the reproductive program because of the significance of the infancy period, passed to the woman, and this assignment of task grew out of the female functioning in reproduction and lactation as decreed by nature. We have curious attempts, such as the *couvade*, that bring the male more intimately into the birth program, but there was no disposition to disturb the routine that gave to the woman the chief responsibility for the nurture of the infant and the young child, and this obligation became a decisive influence in the social distinction of men and women.

[17] Charles J. Brim, *Medicine in the Bible*, pp. 188-189.

The social significance of woman's contribution

Masculine dominance was a social construction. Adaptation to existing conditions of life commonly brought prestige into the hands of men rather than women. This, however, was not the consequence of an inherent inferiority of woman, as repeatedly it has been interpreted during the historic era. The usual status of woman cannot even be used as proof that man possessed in the fundamental processes of social transmission greater power or larger position than woman. From the point of view of significance in the maintenance of culture, comparison is unsafe, but at least the mother was closer to the child in the most impressionable period of the latter's life. This may not have had on the simpler levels of culture the meaning that psychiatric insight now discloses, but even so the primitive mother was in an advantageous position. Man's dominance, where it existed, constituted a cultural attempt to establish the masculine-feminine role in social habits, and was a consequence of reaction to the total conditions of life and not an indication of woman's lesser social significance.

An appraisal of the social value of the female routine as compared with the male routine seems in the light of its fullness of meaning to be fortuitous, but when such a comparison is undertaken, the question at issue becomes the value of the woman's contribution for social organization and continuity as compared with that of the man. This leads to an estimation of the female's meaning for social welfare rather than her recognition. Regarding this, we have the testimony of the biologist that when there is a social difference between the sexes it is the female, as a rule, that is the more, and the male the less, social.[18]

The fashioning of a social code

The persistence of the accumulating recognition of difference in the role of men and women is as much an adaptation, a social-

[18] W. C. Allee, *Social Life of Animals*, p. 259.

izing process, as its origin. As distinctions are carried over into the social system a program accumulates which it is the task of the family to transmit as a part of its function in building continuity and stability. This support is readily given, since the structure and the atmosphere of the family reflect the existing code and in carrying on its normal activities the home builds into the growing consciousness of the child the acceptance of the feminine-masculine regulations, habits, and attitudes. The family does not exclusively take over this standardizing influence, but in none of its transmissions is its contribution greater or more effective.

The key position of the family appears as soon as we ask what would happen if the home-life provided for children attempted to work against the generally accepted differentiation of men and women. Nothing could engender more confusion and disunion, because it would bring continuous clashing with fundamental group principles of behavior. This comes from the fact that the biologic separation of the sexes as it is carried over into a system of social habits is interwined with a multitude of practices and interests. The structural distinction as it is extended through cultural development becomes a basic concept in the folklore of the people, and the individual family is not only acquiescent but is itself constructed in harmony with the group-established allocation of function between the sexes.

The Samoan household is an example of this transmitting of the social code so as to emphasize the distinction between the boy and the girl who know each other as brother and sister "whether they are related by blood, by marriage, or by adoption." A rigid code of etiquette is maintained regulating their association and also their contacts with their elders.[19] As early as nine or ten years of age a system of avoidances is established, and this continues until old age. There is an elaborate and exacting system of taboos, but they are so much a part of the social order that they are taken over by the individual as a

[19] Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, pp. 44-45.

matter of course. Relatives of the opposite sex are not permitted to touch each other, sit close together, eat together, or speak to each other in a familiar manner. These "must nots" are representative of a long list of regulations that are enforced by the group and administered by parents in their association with children. It follows that no outlook upon life becomes more firmly established than this conformity to the social separation of the sexes.

Programs that develop among the various groups are highly individual and evidently register formulations that are accidental in the sense that they are not necessary adaptations to the conditions of life. The recognition of distinction itself is, however, purposeful, and as it takes form in any definite situation it gathers detail, thus providing the variation between the groups. Each system rests upon the fundamental need of recognizing in the social practices a division of social responsibility between the two sexes. Although the family chiefly has the task of transmitting the accepted code to the maturing child, the group has too much at stake not to express in various customs its approval, and, when necessary, its coercion of the individual home in its socializing functions.

Child and sex status

The primitive child, as is true of the modern child, is sensitive to the attitudes of his parents and particularly to those that have to do with the relationship of the father and the mother. This means that the young child naturally responds to the family and group stimuli that express the practices and sentiment reflecting masculine and feminine distinctions. He is placed in a family atmosphere in accord with the common folkways and mores, and as he acquires social habits he takes over the teachings of his surroundings.

The boy and the girl, as they go on toward maturity, move along different pathways. They are introduced to sex status in their family contact, and as they start they continue their

diverse lines of development. The intake of childhood leads to action. Both the boy and the girl respond to adult pressure, and each begins to assume the roles that belong to his or her sex. In great measure they merely follow their impulse to imitate. So long as they tread the beaten path they receive approval. When they balk, protest, or become negligent, they are quickly made to feel the disfavor of the elders. This is not different from what still takes place in the modern home, with the exception that there is less consistency in the attitudes of parents, less of the stereotype in the patterns of behavior. In these more complex households, with their greater emphasis upon individuality, nothing is more impressive than the quickness with which the child, according to sex, assumes a role of superiority or inferiority, of self-expression or submission.

In the simpler culture this emotional fashioning of the child moves toward a definite social status which in most cases emphasizes not only the distinction between the boy and the girl but also the superiority of the former as compared with the latter. The word "dominance" in this connection is somewhat misleading because it gives the impression that one takes an active and the other a passive role. It is rather that the boy gains his prestige, in such circumstances, by a freedom of social expression denied the girl, who in her turn wins social approval by adopting a contrasting program and developing traits of opposite emphasis. In both cases opportunity is given for egoistic satisfaction, but only as each is successful in maintaining the standards associated with his or her sex. The sense of dominance and submission in various degrees may be present or absent. In any case, it is not conscious rivalry of sex with sex but the achievement of each along the line of conventional behavior that brings social approval and the individual's feeling of success. This must always be true in cultures that have well-defined, consistently maintained codes of conduct stressing sex differences.

As the barriers are removed and the boy and girl, the man and woman, come closer together, competition follows, and then

differences bring forth the subjective sense of superiority or inferiority. This principle was strikingly revealed in the early history of woman's education in the United States. The awakening of women to new intellectual opportunity not only gave them strong desire to prove themselves by doing what men did but also created in the average male the reaction that comes when one feels that his status is being attacked.[20]

The certainty and regularity of social routine found in the primitive folkways are needful conditions for group survival among those living in a relatively simple culture. The role of the man and the role of the woman must be firmly established and rigorously enforced. Thus the boy and the girl are driven toward a realization of status and to practices that are in conformity with the position assigned each sex.

The mother vs. the female

During the historic period we have numerous illustrations of the tendency to exalt the woman as a mother and to debase her as a female. Among preliterate peoples we find attitudes that suggest elementary trends toward these opposite concepts. The woman's function in caring for the child is recognized and accepted. It is one of the activities that permit the woman to gain social approval. In contrast, there are notions that show in varying degree and in elementary form a different sort of feeling regarding the woman as a sex partner. For example, when the men are preparing to take the warpath, it is frequently thought that any sexual intimacy with a woman under such circumstances makes the warrior less prepared to meet the stress of battle. It is impossible to classify the woman in her sex partnership as a source of potential weakness in the crucial times of warfare without having for her some degree of contempt that will extend over into other periods. Under other circumstances the man feels in some measure disgust for femaleness. This is not an uncommon reaction to menstruation. This repulsion also tends

[20] Groves, *op. cit.*, pp. 309-324.

to lower the meaning of the woman as a female as compared with her role as mother. These opposite sentiments are not held consistently, but they can be traced in the folklore and folkways of primitive peoples.

The dualistic attitude of men toward women, attraction and fear, which shows itself so frequently in folkways, is too fundamentally based to be characteristic of any cultural period. This same alternation of feeling appears again and again in history, but never so pointedly as in the theology of the middle ages, in which woman is exalted, as symbolized by Mary, and debased, as represented by Eve, whose sin brought death into the world.

Man is not content merely to see woman in contrasting roles, but insists that she act the part; and this demand reaches its ultimate expression in the two types of women—the prostitute who caters to his impulses and demands no respect, and the woman he desires without response of passion that he may place her on a pedestal. This elevation he can accomplish only as he makes her sexless, since he has come to react to the passion-conscious woman as to the fallen woman.

It is not to be supposed that this sharp separation of the two types of women was consistently maintained even during the dominance of medieval theology to such an extent that each woman could be placed on one side or the other of the line, or that marriage was so thoroughly subservient to the notion that there was no marital fellowship, that no reputable woman within domestic privacy gave vent to her passion. Their biological structures were too expressive to permit all women thus to empty themselves of feminine endowment. Men also failed in their intimacies to recoil against physiological sincerity in their wives. Nevertheless, sex in women was loaded with disrepute, and this encouraged at least the concealment of native impulses even when it did not bring forth conflict. This self-negation in the sphere of sex was carried out into other aspects of life and helped to feed masculine dominance by making both men and women feel that it was the destiny of the latter to serve and fulfill the former. This meant to woman more than the loss of

self-expression, a struggle against biological integrity; the notion also carried a lessening of her personality as it brought men and women into contrast and gave one the active and the other the passive role in any effort to gain social prestige. It was natural under such circumstances to value the career of woman according to its adaptability to the demands of man. Thus he gained his social worth through his aggressive prerogative and woman hers from her self-denial. The fact that this program was accepted by women as the natural order of life reveals more than the measure of male dominance. It also discloses how largely woman had surrendered her native impulses and had lost her individuality.

Man himself was caught in this web spun from the superiority-inferiority conventions and was placed in a dilemma. He had too great need of woman not to be conscious of his dependency. Sex forced him out of self-sufficiency, and there was only one way that he could be protected from the hazards of a sex partnership, and that was to discount the physical drive itself. Otherwise he laid himself open to conquest by woman by the very strength of his passion. The way of escape was to discount physical sex itself and to make it socially tainted, something debased. In practice the burden of demonstrating this was turned over to woman. Sex had to be degraded as a means of maintaining masculine dominance, but the program of distortion of the relationships of the sexes brought, in turn, an erotic vengeance. Any strengthening of male-female partnership meant a lessening of masculine dominance.

Antagonism between the sexes

The natural ebb and flow of sex desire is a contributing influence to the development of antagonism between men and women. The alternation of the strength of the biologic drive that leads to human mating invites psychic reactions of contrasting attitudes. When the attraction is diminished, opportunity is provided for a recoil from the drive previously so strong.

In both sexes physical passion moves from hunger to satiety and then in time back again to hunger. In addition there is a pronounced rhythm in the disposition of women that is structurally determined. In the periods when the primitive desire is weak, consciousness not only can feel in full force any rivalry or any social system that fixes the superior or inferior status but also can react in protest against the former need of the other as a sex partner.

The more strongly the individual or his cultural or personal background emphasizes the physical aspects of sex attraction, the more important this organic basis for hostility becomes. As a consequence, in the folkways of simple peoples, as well as in reactions of highly developed, sensitive, modern men and women, we have illustrations of recoil in the form of disgust. These feelings are not confined to the plane on which they originate but are carried into social reactions, thus adding strength to the other trends toward distinction between men and women.

In primitive society we hear more about the men being repelled from the women at times when physical passion is quiescent. In modern society the situation is reversed, and our psychiatric literature, as well as erotic gossip, is replete with cases of women feeling horrified when confronted with masculine passion. The neurotic individual, victimized by colliding desires as a consequence of sexual maladjustment, frequently builds an elaborate system of disgust which serves as a barrier to the impulses he fears, even when to the observer it is apparent he encourages their presence.

The introvert is the more likely to set himself against the tyranny of sex attraction. Wishing independence through self-sufficiency, he balks against the drives that will not let him be content within himself. He may seek freedom through disgust, or he may separate himself from the realities of sex appeal by the idealizing of the mating impulse in the form of daydreams. The extravert may be less inclined to react against sex passion as an intrusion, but he likewise is open to the romances his own mind is making.

The masculine code

Masculine dominance carries with it a code of sex freedom. This becomes one of the distinctions between men and women. The easier code is developed and maintained because, aside from the fact that it is less irksome and superficially more pleasurable, it becomes a symbol of the superiority of the male. This explains the breakdown of the double standard as woman advances nearer to man through education and the acquiring of political rights. The code in the past has not only rested upon the belief that woman was sexually inferior to man, but because of the coercions it engendered it has actually made her seem not only to man but also to herself less endowed with biological passion than he. Her endeavor to keep to the sex role assigned her has in turn made it all the more difficult for her to maintain, even to seek, an equality with man in other social relations. A part of her energy has been necessarily turned against herself because in fact she, too. has been heavily endowed with physical passion.

The masculine code has brought the penalty that might be expected. Women, denied frank expression of their biological impulses, have been led to use sex for ulterior purposes.

For the best development of the human personality it is necessary not only to co-ordinate sex with other human interests but also to incorporate it as a portion of a larger complex, the total personality. In contradiction to this wholesome achievement we have both men and women who attempt to separate sex, and value it as a thing by itself. In the case of men this comes from accepting the attraction of the female while at the same time refusing her as a woman fellowship in a non-sexual comradeship. In like manner there are some women who seek also to accomplish this separation of sex and personality and make use of their sex as the means of gaining nonsexual ends. The most common example of this is the prostitute who makes a business of her femaleness and sells a sex relationship that is severed as much as possible from her life as a whole.

A more significant illustration of this same disposition to exploit sex is provided by the woman who uses her attraction and resources as a female as a means of power over the man or men seeking her gifts. This is a reversal of the usual position of the two sexes, as the man seeking to subjugate becomes himself captured. Any union of this sort, whether conceived of as temporary or permanent, offers little chance for emotional fusion, and the relationship beginning chiefly as sexual remains the same to the end. It is, therefore, unlike that of the prostitute and her client only in that because of its greater permanence it more deeply penetrates both personalities. The deterioration of character is usually so evident that it has become a favorite theme of the novelist and the playwright.

It is usual for men, when they feel that their passion is making them liable to feminine subjection, to free themselves by debasing sex. In this way they preserve their feeling of dominance even though in fact they are driven by a coercive, physical impulse. This policy in turn encourages all the more the divorcement of sex both from the total personality of themselves and, in their thinking and feeling, from their mate.

The prostitute is marked off from other women by her willingness to accept this attempt to isolate sex and regard it as something by itself. She and her partner, therefore, although structurally different, are essentially the same in their attitude toward sex. Emotion in the human person is not only a large part of the sex complex but also its most significant aspect when its effects on the whole personality are considered. The prostitute also, as a consequence, debases sex, and this reaction on her part largely explains her tendency to lose the power of gaining personal pleasure from her heterosexual relations. Sometimes she recovers or more often preserves a remnant of her one-time passion by transferring it to members of her own sex. In these perverted expressions of a previous capacity for normal passion she again recognizes the total personality in her choice of partner, expressing preference as once she did in her contact with men. It is evident that her revolt against the

experience of being treated by men merely as a creature of sex mutilates her psychically and forces her tender emotions to find a substitute for the orthodox man-woman fellowship. The common regulation of a house of prostitution that the girl never refuse a client except on the grounds of venereal infection or some unusually distasteful condition shows that the inmates find it difficult to rid themselves of their former tendency to express choice in their sex intercourse. This demand of the house is one of the features of their occupation which they find most unpleasant.

The one thing that stands out in all the various forms of sexual misalliances is the risk that comes as soon as sex is isolated from the total personality, when either male or female seeks to use it as a means of personal advantage or ego-satisfaction. Human evolution has drawn physical passion into a consolidation of interests in which psychic intercourse takes precedence over the physical. No matter what the motive or the form of any endeavor to extract sex and make it independent of other aspects of the self, the effect is to disturb the conditions that are necessary even for a vital, self-maintaining, physical fellowship. The man-woman relationship may be primitive and it may be meager in content, but it rarely thrives when it is built upon a sex interest that is attemping to separate from the total personality. Personal relationships do not prosper when they reverse racial history, the evolutionary trend that has embedded sex in the individual's total personality.

Family conditioning by masculine-feminine status

The family, both in its structure and functioning, adapts itself to the prevailing masculine-feminine status. This placement of the sexes as they react to each other's position is a major domestic determinant. The individual family accepts the standard program and recognizes the practical consequences of this in the numerous details of home adjustment. Much of this is mere routine that proceeds as a matter of course and without atten-

tion. This feeling that the social prescriptions constitute the normal manner of life together, or rather, perhaps, the absence of any feeling at all regarding the matter, shows how thoroughly the man and the woman are prepared for their sex role by the training they receive mostly during childhood and at the hands of their parents.

Any departure from usual practices changes the situation from a smooth-working routine to a state of tension ranging from mild protest to serious conflict. If the family itself accepts any variation from the usual order, the group, once it becomes aware of this, unless domestic life is very generally demoralized, shows its opposition. Hardly any departure from the beaten path will bring more disapproval. This may be expressed in derision or in open attack or by the policy of isolating the disturbing family. The more stable and systematized the family practices of the group, the less possibility of any variability. Conversely, confusion as to standard or a rapid change in the male-female status expresses itself in domestic disorganization and a weakening of the family as a social institution.

The individual family, as has been brought out in an earlier discussion, is constantly transmitting the basic attitudes that bring the boy and girl into accord with the cultural placing of the man and the woman. The masculine-feminine status and the family as a social institution are so fundamentally and significantly tied together that either can be interpreted as a by-product of the activities of the other. To give both of them their just place in the social order, however, requires the specific recognition of each as a social development. They are interrelated institutions, both called into existence as a means of finding a workable program for the male-female co-operation necessary for human survival.

XII. *The Family Support of Religion*

THE FAMILY AND RELIGION. The motive behind the Church in its modern form is so ancient and universal as to appear in some sort of expression in every culture of which we now have knowledge. This underlying human need so spreads itself in every highly developed civilization that it defies simple definition. Nevertheless, the drive behind it can best be described as a quest for security. It is this urge that produces religious experience among the simpler peoples and, in spite of the elaboration that permits expression of individual differences and conscious motives, it undoubtedly remains in our time the fundamental explanation of religious beliefs and practices.

Folklore and anthropological investigations of primitive culture provide a quantitative testimony to the use that men and women have made of religious beliefs and ceremonies as means of security. Religion, therefore, has been one of the major patterns of behavior created in the effort to bring about conditions propitious for survival. There is no longer need to stake its existence upon an inherent instinct, it is so clear that man from the first felt the hazards of existence, both personally and socially, in the midst of forces that, although they made manifest their power, were uncertain, mysterious, and unknown.[1]

Beset with fears, forced to recognize human weakness, constantly awed and driven to suspicion, man protected himself by conceiving forces greater than those that threatened him and those that from time to time brought him disaster. It was not only necessary for him to renew confidence by establishing

[1] Joyce O. Hertzler, *Social Progress*, p. 532.

beliefs in allies greater than himself but also imperative that he have the means of enlisting the sympathy of the benign influences or of lessening the hostility of those that endangered his existence. The institution of religion as both idea and practice was the answer.

> Just as every poison has its antidote, if we only knew where to find it, so human instincts and energies are equally balanced; hence it was that the higher instincts of confidence and veneration, which were also in man, but lying fallow, counteracted the antipathetic effects of forces that, had they been left in undisputed possession of the arena, would have terminated not merely in disaster, but possibly in the utter extinction of humanity. For it seems to me quite reasonable to infer that it is to this dualism, or conflicting principle of natural unity, that nature, certainly humanity, owes her very existence.[2]

It is important to keep in mind, as Leonard insists, that this development of religion as a provision for survival was not something that came through conscious effort but instead arose spontaneously, the emotional answer to the predicament in which man felt himself.[3]

Religion an extension of control

The circumstances in which primitive man found himself so stressed his frailties in the presence of awe-bringing happenings that he had no choice but to find some way of extending his frontier of control. The things that he could do with his own strength were insufficient to give him any sense of security. Even where his craftsmanship provided means of livelihood, the constant sense of possible calamities drove him to find some way to gain greater power to protect and to accomplish. This he found in his magic, in his enlistment of powers beyond himself. The events of his life, even such commonplace experi-

[2] A. G. Leonard, *The Lower Niger and Its Tribes*, pp. 87-88.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

ences as sleep, brought him constant bafflement, feelings of helplessness and of suspicion. The most ordinary routines were weighted with mystery. In such a state of mind, the meaning of this existence must be found in the psychic reactions; the urge toward a security that neither he alone nor with others could provide made the religious institution imperative. We cannot discount the value of this because in our objective analysis his beliefs and practices seem fictitious, false supports. The test must be the value of these notions as resources for his survival. From this viewpoint they were substantial assets. Testimony to the household feeling that its well-being demands religious sanction appears in the following prayer given by a Plains Cree after the poles of the *tipi* had been put in place:

> To-day is the day I put up my home. I leave you to the care of the four winds. To-day is the day you see yourself in my lodge, where you can do as you please. We cannot tell you to do this and that; we are only men. You, our Maker, direct us whether it be bad or good; it is your will. Help us to think of you every day we live in this lodge; guard us in our sleep; wake us in the morning with clean minds for the day, and keep harm from us.[4]

Familial motives for religion

It is difficult for the modern student to recreate the atmosphere of primitive life so as to realize how forceful is the pressure coming out of the environmental setting toward the use of religion as a social institution. The closer man is to nature, the more he feels himself at the mercy of inexplicable forces; the greater his sense of mystery, the more compelling his desire to find resources beyond himself that can protect him against his fears of the unknown. Without insight, and placed under the influence of natural causation which is constantly taking before him some awful expression, he has no

[4] Wilson D. Wallis, *An Introduction to Anthropology*, p. 289. Reprinted by permission of Harper and Brothers, publishers.

escape from the feeling of insecurity. He must look beyond himself and beyond the defenses provided by his usual association with others. The product of this drive toward a something more assuring is religious sentiment, which, once started, encouraged by persistent human need, goes forward in its own evolution.

The modern student, looking backward, is handicapped, because, although it is not hard intellectually to reconstruct primitive conditions of life, it is not possible to relive emotionally the circumstances that once rested so heavily upon man's imagination. The obstruction comes from two changes characteristic of any highly developed civilization.

On the one hand we are in touch with an immense amount of perceptual material which softens even the disasters that nature inflicts. We have explanations of the working of natural law, and at least they remove the mysterious, malevolent meaning that primitive man continuously read into the catastrophes that appeared to him to be the blows of some unfriendly power, which he naturally interpreted as personal. Not only do the intellectual concepts man has gathered through his long period of development lessen the intimacy of his relationship with nature, removing, except under extraordinary circumstances, the feeling that misfortune is coming from some malicious influence, but this knowledge that has accumulated is in fact able to reduce the hazards of environmental forces, and this provides confidence while at the same time lessening the dangers of human existence. Man's conquest of epidemics is an illustration of the psychic as well as the medical advantage of recent knowledge. The primitive person is not without a mass of perceptual material, but it is saturated with his fears, and instead of making him feel less need of spiritual defenses, it adds strength to the feeling that impels him toward religious resources.

In addition to this protection we have a considerable loss, under the conditions of modern life, in the directness of man's contact with his natural environment. This appears most clearly

in urban culture, where men and women are ordinarily little conscious of the meeting of man with nature in the raw. Instead, there is so much interposed between individuals and the natural forces that man's contact with nature is, like his most frequent associations with people, of a secondary rather than a primary type. The earthquake, the flood, and the tornado may occasionally sweep aside the usual circumstances and force city-dwellers for a moment to feel and react with greater likeness to their prehistoric predecessors. As a rule, man's attention is not drawn to the natural environment in the undoctored way that the primitive had to meet it, but is given because of nature's esthetic appeal. Then the thundercloud is looked at not because it carries hazards, mysterious death-giving forces, but because of its beauty. The refinement is a product of an artificial, sophisticated, cultural development that hides the sensitivities of primitive people.

This change does not mean that religion loses its appeal, but rather that it approaches man along an entrance that gave small opening into the everyday life, the thinking and feeling, of primitive culture. The incentives toward religion still fundamentally come forth from the human desire for greater security, but the motives are drawing rather than compelling. The quality of the security itself has changed, and this in turn has transformed the motives. The incentives are, therefore, more complex, artificial modifications of the original eagerness for support beyond the self and beyond the group. Religion is called upon to insure the values and is not, as a rule, sought as a means of protection against the forces of nature that are conceived of as alien.

Although primitive man, as we know him in the cultures that have come down to us, has a quantity of perceptual material, we misinterpret this when we fail to realize that its meaning must be found in its emotional significance rather than in the fact that it is a product of his thinking. If this is recognized, added meaning is given to the influence of the family as a means of encouraging and preserving the religious institution.

The household, even in primitive life, had an intimacy and emotional atmosphere that necessarily reflected the pressures that enforce the religious notions upon man's feeling and thinking. The family responded to the sense of responsibility associated with the mere fact of its existing and functioning. This did not mean an intermittent awareness of its need to strengthen the religious motives of life, but a continuous disposition to protect itself and society by following the cultural practices.

This must not be regarded as the mere expression of the individual members of the family, for in so far as the family group constituted a unit it also carried on religiously. Nothing that we now know of primitive family experience leads to the belief that the household was only a collection of persons allied through self-interest in undertakings that make for personal and social preservation. Instead, the family was itself a social institution, a unit of interest, a clustering point for sentiments. It was this union of persons bound together by relationship that accepted its portion of responsibility for the observance of religious responsibilities. The family gathered about itself apperceptive material, an accumulation of concepts that served as a cushion between the fearsome environment and the security needs of the family unit.

Family experience and the development of religion

As a consequence of this oneness of the household members, the family as an institution contributed from its own experience to the growth of religion. This was more than the strengthening of spiritual vitality, the meeting of religious duties. The family also contributed out of its own experience to vitalize the sentiments which grow and flower in religion.

Ancestor worship was one of these. The ties of family relationship were reflected in the growth of reverence for the departed, which in time took on the character of a cult. Without assuming that this is an inevitable stage in religious development, it was clearly encouraged by feelings naturally generated

within the household. It was, of course, strengthened measurably not only by reactions to death but also by the fear of the dead. Former members of the household who once had their share of power and had demonstrated their commitment to the interest of the family were still regarded as influences capable of doing good or ill, and every effort was made to keep them propitious. It would narrow the motivations to regard this trend toward ancestor worship as merely the recognition of possible evil from the dead. Undoubtedly veneration played a part, for human affection is too organically rooted to be thought of as a modern innovation. Primitive man's attitude toward death, his inability to divorce it from magical causation,[5] nevertheless placed upon the household religious compulsions of unescapable strength.

A deviation also influenced by family experience shows itself in the notion of the all-father, the more or less matured idea of anthropomorphized beings which appears in early mythologies.[6] It is easy to exaggerate this in the effort to find a starting place for monotheistic trends,[7] and not to recognize the borrowing of this concept from higher cultures. Primitive man, however, was undeniably anthropomorphic.[8] He carried over to his religious creations the gathering of his own experience, an impressive part of which falls within the family unit and emphasizes headship.

Although it is too much to insist upon a clear translation from familial experience of the notion of the Supreme Father, God, family life, impressing the idea, contributed largely to its growth. An example that illustrates the drift is the belief in household gods, of which the following is an illustration:

> We turn now to the private and family gods—those which are kept within the house and compound and which have a much closer connection with the individual than those which are public

[5] Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, *Primitive Mentality*, pp. 62-67.
[6] Alexander Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, pp. 211-214.
[7] E. Washburn Hopkins, *Origin and Evolution of Religion*, p. 279.
[8] Ernest Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, pp. 62-63.

and general. It must be again emphasized that no object in itself is worshipped by the Ibos; it is sacred only as the habitation of a spirit. It has only that relative sanctity to which it is entitled as the shrine or home of a certain spirit. Very seldom are the objects themselves called upon by name; the petitions are invariably addressed to the igaw-maw, i.e. the spirits.

.

Each house contains many sacred objects, but they have not all equal significance, for among the "gods many and lords many" there are higher and lower degrees of importance. The most universal of these household gods, and that which is given first rank, is the Ikenga, and no house may be without one. It is the first god sought by a young man at the beginning of his career, and it is the one to which he looks for good luck in all his enterprises.[9]

As culture grew and anthropomorphism was encouraged,[10] family experience with its massive emotional content added its influences to the trend toward the idea of a supreme deity.

The second emphasis of family experience that appeared in the development of the institution of religion was phallic worship. It cannot, of course, be said that the erotic impulse showed itself only within marriage. Such a concentration is not true in the primitive societies we now know, and there is certainly no reason to suppose that it was otherwise in the more distant past, far beyond our knowledge. Nevertheless, sex had an important place in marriage relationships. It was conventionally assigned to the husband-wife intimacy, just as it has been in the historic period.

Phallic worship

Phallic worship was a recognition and a veneration of the powers of reproduction. It was an attempt to bring within

[9] G. T. Basden, *Among the Ibos of Nigeria*, pp. 218-219.
[10] J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, p. 423.

the protective religious system the magic clustering about generation. Primitive literature is replete with illustrations showing the native's feeling that magic is associated with sex, with pregnancy, and with childbirth. An example is the common feeling that it would invite disaster to have intercourse before proceeding to war.[11] Menstruation, pregnancy, and lactation, as a rule, have associated with them not only ideas of magic but also the need of recognizing taboos. Ceremonial rites are built up as protective mechanisms against the hazards of magic associated with specific physiological events belonging to the reproductive process.

The notion of the transference of the magic associated with generation shows itself in taboos against intercourse at the time of the planting of crops or the opposite reaction, looking upon sex intercourse as a means of assuring fertility.[12] The Pipiles of Central America furnished a good illustration of this when the priest made the following procedure a religious duty and forbade the sowing of seed contrary to this program:

> For four days before they committed the seed to the earth the Pipiles of Central America kept apart from their wives "in order that on the night before planting they might indulge their passions to the fullest extent; certain persons are even said to have been appointed to perform the sexual act at the very moment when the first seeds were deposited on the ground."[13]

This conception of the relationship between intercourse and the magic-producing fertility was at certain stages of culture extraordinarily common. No mystery impressed itself more upon the primitive mind than that of birth. The power of reproduction, in so far as it gathered clarity as a concept, became a clustering point for magic and ceremonial rites.

[11] Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages*, vol. 2, p. 492.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] From J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, p. 136. By permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers.

This development went along with the growth of ancestor worship. The position of the male within the family led to the making of the phallus the symbol of authority and dominance. The female organ likewise was distinguished and revered. There is no standard expression of this regard of male and female aspects of human reproduction, although the trend seems to have stressed the male in worship in the same way that he was given headship in the family.[14]

As a consequence, considerable evidence of the great hold this religious concept has had upon human nature appears in such a miscellany of expression as a hieroglyphic character among the Egyptians, the linga symbol of a pillar with two stones at the base,[15] and especially carvings of stone representing both male and female sex organs. The linga is so revered by the Hindus that it is not too much to say that it is still regarded as the visible representation of the Creator by more than three million.[16] There are so many monuments in India representing the sex organs as to constitute a cultural trait.[17] Many of these are shrines to which go women burdened by infertility, that they may gain the magic that will permit them to conceive.[18] A study of Hindu culture shows how intimately sex worship is bound up with the family institution, especially as it distinguishes the differing status of man and woman. If phallus worship obtained direction from familial experience, it is likewise true that it tended to maintain the marriage code, especially the male and female status. It can be interpreted as a social institution in itself, but even then it must be catalogued as belonging to the evolution of religion as this shaped itself in formal organization. There are innumerable suggestions that this sense of mystery which is associated with human reproduction still intrudes and hampers the building of an intelligent sex code that is more in accord with the insight of present science.

[14] O. A. Wall, *Sex and Sex Worship*, p. 382.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 384.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 384.
[17] Emma Hawkridge, *Indian Gods and Kings*, p. 4.
[18] Wall, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

The child's responses to religious stimuli

The child is more suspectible to religious emotion than the adult. Foreign as is any dogma or other attempt to embody religious feeling and fashion it as an intellectual construction, the reactions to life that constitute the supports of religion are native to the child from early years. What is now so characteristic of children, even in a highly complex culture, must have been at least as true from the first appearance of substantial religious sentiments. In other words, in any civilization the child is naturally primitive and thereby prepared to take over the religious teachings of his family and community.

This is in part an effect of the emptiness of his life with respect to conceptual material. The cushion that he brings to his environmental contacts is thin indeed, and this leads him to accept with avidity anything provided by his elders that gives him greater feeling of security. Void as he is of the resources that the adult accumulates through experience, he is made keenly sensitive to his environment, particularly to its mysteries, its suggestions of danger, its evils and tragedies. His poverty of insight makes him an easy victim of imagination, and when his parents suffer by faulty interpretation, their reactions are multiplied by his own. This indirect reception of fears which come forth from the dangers and calamities assumed to be inflicted by malevolent forces pushes him all the harder toward any refuge the institution of religion promises. The mechanism occurs in the life of the modern child who can detect the fears and anxieties of his parent when the latter assumes he has been hiding them from his offspring.

The conditions in simple society, as related to religious experience, would lead the parent for reasons of prudence not to attempt to soften these adult emotions but rather to encourage the child to take them over and act upon them. We know that it is not possible even for the sophisticated, modern adult to maintain a neutral emotional response to life, since there are

physiological accompaniments that go along with his contacts with his environment, probably common even in his sleep.[19] Children are more helpless. In the light of this it is apparent how strongly the situation of the primitive child invites to their utmost the reactions that create a demand for security through religious faith.

These fears that still today well up so naturally into the consciousness of the child are utilized to the full in the primitive processes of social control. Even in these days it is disastrous in the training of the child to leave out teachings of danger, but the good technique demands that these be intellectualized as motives for positive prudential behavior rather than left as mere experiences of fearfulness.[20] A great part of the parent's problem consists now in utilizing this raw material that the emotions provide and working it over so that it forms rational, social motives leading toward greater maturity. There was little purpose for such a policy until culture accumulated a considerable amount of objective facts that replaced the assumptions of magic, the notion of a permeation of spiritual forces, at best only possibly benevolent, all through the natural phenomena.

With the coming of strong feelings of suspicion, of insecurity, the child characteristically looks to the parent for support and defense. This in primitive society means joining with the parent in doing those things, as far as he can share them, that are the basis of adult confidence. This demands nothing unusual in thought or feeling, because the very atmosphere of the child's existence is his belief in a pervasive magic that continually needs to be reconciled or made, by the right attitudes and practices of the group, to administer confidence and assistance. The family's teaching of religious sentiments is all the more effective because it is a by-product much of the time of the attitudes and activities of the adult members of the family. No influences from the parents have easier entrance into the

[19] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, p. 69.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

child's emotions than those making him subservient to the prevailing religious institution in its various expressions. He is a ready candidate, and he has eager teachers. The parents are all the more concerned because they have no notion of innocence when the child accidentally breaks a taboo, challenges the magic, or fails in the religious practices. Such happenings are expected to bring evil to the household or the clan as certainly as to the parent or child. Accidents, as such, have no existence.[21]

Religion and adolescence

In modern life the religious crisis occurs naturally during the adolescent period. The organic changes taking place at that time explain the opportunity the emotions have in this time of passage out of childhood and the ease with which previous childhood training may be taken over into conscious adult sentiment and practice or openly repudiated. Even when this break with the past occurs, it does not, of course, prove that there has been a complete erasing of the earliest impressions.

Formal religious organizations have realized the emotional significance of adolescence and have attempted in their program to cater to the impulses of young people. Failure to win youth means a considerable loss of potential support. In primitive life the organic disturbances played little part in leading youth to social innovations. The culture clearly strangled any incentive for self-expression on the part of the individual that would make trouble. However, there was not usually a mere negative policy but a turning of the native impulses accompanying puberty into appropriate behavior. This policy appeared in the religious institutions. One of the most illuminating examples of this is reported by Ruth Benedict.[22] She describes a blending of the guardian spirit complex with adolescent ceremonies. The climax of these rites in Indian culture found in British

[21] Lévy-Bruhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-51.
[22] Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture*, p. 39.

Columbia was the acquisition of a guardian spirit that comes as a controlling influence in the life-career of the young man. His professional life was thus determined by his supernatural ally. The girls also had their guardian spirits by whom their domestic duties were spiritualized.

The family and the church

If the word "church" is taken to mean the most formal organization of religion, it is clear that the family support is as indispensable for the maintenance of this institution as it is for culture taken in its widest meaning. It is also evident that the same mechanisms that permit the family to draw the child into the cultural complex and to give direction to his impulses appear in the maintenance of religious interest. The child is not only deeply influenced by the preachments and the examples of his parents, but he also has a strong desire to maintain with others the happy relationship he experiences with his parents. His incentive to belong, at least to assume the adult pattern of behavior as he interprets it, makes unnecessary coercive influence to drive the young child toward the religious concepts or routine that he finds established. It is merely required that they exist with social approval and have parental backing. The child covets the privilege of belonging religiously just as he does in any other sphere of group interest, and this is sufficient to give the family, as long as culture is not complex and conflicting within itself, power to determine his religious career.

The dominance given the family shows itself most impressively in the child's development when religion forms itself into a distinct familial type. Such a coalescence of two strong emotional desires—security with parents and security through supernatural sanction—necessarily produces a religion of extraordinary vitality, with a closeness to life that weaves its influence into everyday events. Again and again in the historic period such religious organizations have flourished, the father

of the family usually assuming the prerogative of religious leadership, and frequently taking over priestly functions. At other times, as was common in the American colonial period, the most effective expression of religious feeling appears in family worship. Modern life reveals how much the church has lost where this familial type of religion has disappeared and the home has attempted to delegate its religious functions to the specialized, formal institution, the church.

The modern family and the church

The extravertive emphasis of our prevailing Western civilization has influenced the church as a formal institution, frequently leading to specific, individual, minor organizations that make their appeal through activities that are religious merely in the sense that they are part of the church program and are backed up by religious sanctions. The temptation to do this has been especially strong in the effort to win the interest of youth. Religious sentiment in its more mature formation demands a life-experience withheld from the young. Instead of catering to the child and young person on the level of his potential spiritual self-expression, the easier task of providing entertainment and activity through "programs" has too frequently been the policy of the church. This has brought the churches into competition with commercial organizations that excel them in similar provisions for the immature. So far as external activity is concerned, whether it consists of social gatherings, picnics, hikes, or camping for the young, benevolence, reform, or mere emotional intoxications for those older, there is nothing that the church can furnish that is not more effectively provided by other organizations, commercial or social in their motives.

The vitality of the church today, as always, must come from religious experience and introvertive awakening to the craving for a spiritual fellowship which transcends the world of ordinary affairs. Although there are certainly great differences between persons, human nature still reveals, as it did so clearly

in primitive culture, the working of that explorative and demanding imagination which first created religious values. Given encouragement, this seeking of a security beyond that provided by social organization or material achievement appears in its characteristic, seasonable expressions early in childhood. It offers the parent the opportunity to nourish impulses that create the need of religion, and thereby bestows a spiritual function upon the institution of the church.

Industry and commerce as they have developed in the Western world require for their maintenance and, as a consequence, for the establishment of social stability an artificial stress of extravertive cravings. This leads to an unbalancing of the inner and the outer life which in turn affects adversely both the family and the church. Domesticity as a satisfying experience demands achievement of values beyond the mere utilitarian advantages of fellowship. The church in the degree that it fosters genuine religious sentiment has to have commitments from human nature that are greater than can be satisfied through betterment or activity programs. Much of the present social restlessness testifies to the difficulty of the average man who seeks satisfaction and security by excessively externalizing his values. A failure of either the church or the home to cope with the task, which has become the primary one of modern man, of enriching his life-career enormously through material achievement, without loss of the incentives that impel him toward realities beyond the territory of his material conquests, adds to the difficulties of the other institution.

Both art and religion can carry man beyond the province of either utility or luxury, but the widespread failure to accomplish this tends to disorganize the family in the same way that it tempts the church toward an easier ministration than that of helping modern man keep in proper balance his material and spiritual incentives.

Both religion and the family, especially the latter's matrimonial aspects, also have in common another danger which is an opposite reaction against the prevailing dominance of

extravertive values. Each is used as an escape mechanism, a means of retreating from an environmental reality that seems to the individual too emotionally oppressive to be endured. Fundamentally therapeutic as this may be as protest against the tyranny of externalized values, it only ensnares the person in his self-made deception. The family or the church is used as a shield against reality, but the afflicted person, to keep his false security, is forced to build larger and thicker barriers against the facts. Since the inner reality cannot be maintained by attempting to repudiate the outer, he who flees to either church or family in order to escape untoward circumstances is driven into neurotic isolation.

On the other hand, as Whitehead says,[23] domestic love becomes a passionate desire for the triumph of the beautiful. It possesses the same inward craving for spiritual expression that brings forth art and religion. Domestic love may be distracting, as he insists, but if so, because it not only assumes a friendly universe but also expresses an intense striving for fulfillment of the deepest of human cravings. Thus it partakes of that essential reaching out beyond ordinary human achievements which is characteristic of religion. Domestic love becomes an assurance of cosmic reliability, the certainty of response to the value-seeking that makes human nature religious. This confidence, grounded in family experiences, has found expression among many Christians in making marriage a religious sacrament.

[23] Alfred N. Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 373.

XIII. *Family Interactions*

THE MEANING OF INTERACTION. The term "interaction" has become an indispensable concept in the vocabulary of the sociologist. It signifies the interplay of persons in association. It implies not a mere reaction of one person in the presence of another, but rather an effective response establishing a degree of relationship. Interaction thus becomes the essential process of socialization, a causal interchange made possible through some means of communication which permits a reciprocity of influence. It is not a momentary contact but a continuing awareness and response which ordinarily has, in changing proportions, passive and aggressive attitudes of the persons brought together.

In the association each personality becomes the cause and effect of the other. Viewed socially, interaction is the causal process which permits the organization of individuals into a group. This does not mean that it is sought necessarily as a means of establishing some type of society, since the mere being together of persons who respond to one another becomes a socializing process. It is, however, something more than mere proximity or even communication. Nevertheless, persons who by any means are brought into contact are impelled to recognize and respond each to the other in such a way as to make interaction inevitable. The concept has one meaning but in actual experience the form of such responses has a wide variability. For example, a person may respond so feebly as to be called absentminded when confronted with something outside his interests, while the same person actively interested may make strong reactions.

There are also habitual differences due to the character of the

person, ranging from great susceptibility and an intense response to influence, to stubborn resistance to its reception. We also have interaction of a different order when the relationship is between an individual and a group and the responses express a conscious interplay of one personality in contrast with the others acting as a unit. The individual student, for instance, has different attitudes and a different quality of interaction as he is associated with his comrades spontaneously and with the same persons when they symbolize a fraternity organization. Another common illustration of this same difference is the different situations in a roomful of persons when they are talking together and when they have been called to order for some sort of formal meeting and one member is addressing the others. There is apt to be a greater realization of the fact that interaction is taking place when the individual is reacting to a unified or at least formally organized group than when the responses are being made back and forth, person to person. This difference must be recognized in family relationships since in the home both types occur.

Interaction modifies behavior

The test of the existence of interaction is whether there is in fact a modification of behavior on the part of each person because of his relationship with the other. Contrarily, whoever remains detached prevents by his isolation the process of mutual influence. By not responding to the socializing process he remains outside and is at the moment, in the concrete situation where he happens to be placed, unsocial.[1] This aloofness is, however, difficult to maintain. There may be eager effort to escape interaction, the positive choice of keeping apart and indifferent, but this disposition is rarely neutral enough to prevent some degree of interaction. The responses may be supremely subtle, even unrecognized in consciousness, but to maintain his

[1] R. W. Park and E. W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, p. 341.

psychic separation the person requires an unconcern that seldom can exist when one person comes in contact with some other individual or some group.

The effort not to respond to another is usually a product of dislike or even hatred, and this in turn as an emotion is a positive reaction and one that can hardly escape open expression. This appears in Franklin H. Giddings's discussion of interaction as consciousness of kind. By this term he meant the simple, original state of consciousness which came to any being who recognized another as a character similar to himself.[2] As a consequence of his emphasis of conflict as a preceptional response of persons in contact, Giddings pointed out that any meeting or encounter brings the feeling of likeness or unlikeness.[3] At least this experience bears testimony to the fact that the most casual contacts bring reaction even though it is nothing more than the emotions awakened by a sense of coldness or aversion. Edward Everett Hale, in his story of the man without a country, portrayed a struggle that seemed an endless death to the victim, who felt himself completely pushed out of national association. His supreme social suffering came from being denied a milieu of persons. Such a life, devoid of the possibility of interactions, would bring the most unendurable of punishments. The mind denied its elemental need would in time furnish substitutes through self-creation until the normal grip with reality would be lost and the fictitious projections would replace the realities.

The family by its nature is especially prone to create in some member this sense of being shut out. Interpreted as this may be as at least a temporary breaking down of familial association, it is in fact a most consequential, emotionally laden form of interaction. The timelessness of familial relationships, previously discussed, explains the extraordinary vitality of home in the reacting of one-time household members who have severed themselves, as they supposed by desire, from their former association.

[2] *The Principles of Sociology*, p. 18.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

Contact a prerequisite to interaction

It is obvious that there must first be a meeting of persons before there can be any interaction, but as the sociologists point out, this coming together must be something more than just one person's being in the presence of the other. There has to be some form of communication. This need not be in the form of language nor does it have to take such an open expression as signs. A glance of the eye, for example, easily establishes contact and under some circumstances serves as a communication that makes interaction possible. Ordinarily, however, our interactions proceed through the use of the human resource of language, and the advantage this gives us over anything possessed by the animals is one of the reasons why contact has so much more social meaning for us than for creatures having less adequate communication.

It is necessary, for any understanding of human interaction, to recognize the differences in the kinds of contacts. The most impressive relationship is the face-to-face association, which is called primary. This is a characteristic of the family and is frequently emphasized in descriptions of domestic experience. In contrast with this we have what is known as secondary contact, an infrequent, partial association in which interaction functions in certain zones of personality interest but not over the entire extent of the individual life. This sort of relationship is a characteristic of much of the interaction that goes on in cities where people are together in their work for a limited period and where their private life is generally suppressed or at least not spontaneously fully brought forth as would be true in the intimacies of the home.

Modern invention has made necessary another term to indicate the relationship of persons who do have a degree of association, although it is frequently one-sided and in any case much less than that provided by secondary contacts, but which cannot be left out of any realistic description of modern life. This cursory association takes place, for example, through the radio. The

most perfect example of it would be communication of amateurs who from a great distance know each other to the degree that personality can be revealed by communication through the air. Before the radio was invented professional telegraphers came to know each other by idiosyncracies expressed as they communicated back and forth over the wires.

A different sort of cursory contact, enormously significant even though it is one-sided, and stereotyped so far as the medium of expression that brings the concrete relationship is concerned, is the motion picture. Looked at, however, from the consequence it has as an impression that one person makes upon another, it is sometimes more causal as an influence upon thinking and behavior, especially on the child and the young adolescent, than the more usual primary familial fellowship. This easily becomes apparent if one notices the effects upon the vocabulary, upon mannerisms, upon standards, and even emotional attitudes that come from the moving picture and that are not in agreement with the family conditions or attitudes.

It is necessary, indeed, to distinguish between the type of the contact and its significance as an interaction. Ordinarily, primary contacts are so much more causal than any other that it is usually taken for granted that they have the greater meaning, and it is in this sense that the term "primary" became an accepted description. It does not follow, however, that any particular primary relationship has greater or even as much importance in its causal effects as some particular secondary or cursory association. As a massive accumulation, primary intercourse is distinctive and commanding. It is likewise true that not all primary associations are of the same order. All possible variations in the effectiveness of interaction are revealed when comparisons are made between different families, all having in common face-to-face intimacy. Nor is the significance of primary contacts so consistent and standard that such differences in influence can be charged to the idiosyncrasy of domestic life.

In addition to this dissimilarity between families in the same

community, variation on account of unlikeness in cultural background must also be reckoned with. Even in peoples having such closeness in cultural kinship as the English and the Americans, for example, family interaction clearly reveals such differences. A great part of what is charged to race by the superficial observer is in fact a product of differing primary experiences. This is not only unlikeness in kind; it is also something that varies in degree. These conditioning influences forbid any interpretation of the family that isolates it from its cultural setting and that defines all domestic interaction as of the same social value.

The test always is: What comes from the interaction and what significance do the influences of the home have on the growing personality? In its comparison with other institutions, the family, because it furnishes the earliest nurture, takes a commanding position; but from this it must not be assumed that all families irrespective of cultural conditions have the same value. The family only provides the means of primary intimacy. The entire social complex determines the significance of the interactions that result from the contact.

The family and the significance of contact

In the highly complex civilizations where conditions permit individual families to acquire their peculiar characteristics, the primary contacts of a particular home may degenerate—that is, lose their effectiveness—until they may seem to the outsider more adequately described as secondary than as primary. They do not lose their intimate features, and in this sense they must be catalogued as primary associations; but so far as influence or interaction is concerned, they fall below the potency of secondary contacts to which the individuals make greater causal responses. Even cursory contacts in these cases may have a domestic meaning that their indirectness, their actual anonymity so far as personal intimacy is concerned, would never suggest.

Cursory contact and domestic relations

At the present time the moving picture has found entrance into all civilized countries and even into what we are wont to call primitive cultures. American pictures are widely imported, and travelers tell us of weird experiences when they see some production of Hollywood shown to people who cannot understand the language of the talking picture or read the symbols of the silent picture. Wherever the motion pictures go, they act as a cultural invasion, and this, aside from the financial incentives, explains the eagerness with which each aggressive civilization seeks to spread the popularity of its own productions and protect its peoples from those that would rival its creations.

The student of the family is interested in the interactions that occur between cultures through the mechanical inventions that provide opportunity for cursory experience. The motion pictures seem at present to be of greatest importance, although competition from the radio is so great that some readers would prefer to choose it as the example of the cursory contacts that affect domestic life.

Among other fields, motion pictures exploit a wide range of experience that can be classified as courtship. In this they merely respond to the prevailing romance that so characteristically has gathered about the mating impulse in the United States, and dramatize the interest so generally shared by our people. The portrayal is, however, forceful in the influences it brings, especially to the young, and this in turn has practical consequences in the association of young people. It is here that we find the possibility of any individual young person responding to the directing influences of the motion pictures in greater degree than to the more conscious effort at guidance of his parents. This is especially true when the parents are not well adjusted to the conditions that American youth face in their love-making. Youth who come from the more indifferent homes are still better candidates for the reception of the attitudes and practices that the films encourage by their presentation.

When these portrayals are brought into a foreign culture, although their influence is less, they provide more than mere entertainment. This appears most clearly in the reactions of young people, who are not uncommonly enticed to efforts at imitation. The strength of such reactions, however, is found within the culture where the pictures originate, for there they act as a standardizing influence. Even when they fail to engender imitations they may bring sophistication and tolerance where without them there would be innocence and resistance. The genuineness of this interaction is testified to by the attention, for commercial reasons, given by actors, actresses, and producers to the fan mail.

The influence of the motion pictures, as one would expect, is greatest during the period that we recognize as the time when the love impulse awakes and the erotic career begins to take form. The greatest susceptibility is therefore in early adolescence. Although the portrayal of love scenes interests adults as well as adolescents, the former recognize the unreality of what they see while the latter tend to incorporate the ideas suggested in their growing consciousness of love. The age level of greatest response has been found to be among the sixteen-year-olds.[4] Interest in love drama and imitation ranges through the period of from twelve to eighteen, there being, of course, great difference in the time when the individual child begins to grasp the meaning of what he sees.

With the coming of puberty and the start of the mating impulse, the child in any culture begins to form his courtship ideals and technique as he responds to the influences that play upon him in his cultural situation. In modern life the motion pictures provide both information regarding love-making and techniques that are naturally copied, in so far as the particular young person finds this possible. The adolescent mind is alert to the opportunity of gathering up suggestions that can be carried over first into daydreaming and then into the practices of courtship.

[4] W. W. Charters, *Motion Pictures and Youth: A Summary*, p. 27.

The autobiographies of children show how largely these influences from the love scenes of the motion pictures penetrate. They copy with conscious effort what they see, and undoubtedly to a still greater extent imitate without realizing what they are doing. Since often they are not given any genuine assistance as they start to build their love careers, they are all the more open to what the motion pictures present. In Blumer's study from 458 autobiographies written by high-school students, it was found that 33 per cent admitted definite imitation of the pictures, 28 per cent denied this, and the others failed to give any definite clue as to what took place. Probably, as is suggested by the investigator, these statements are overconservative, since it is to be supposed that many young people would not wish to acknowledge or may not be conscious of the suggestions that they in fact did accept.[5] Difficult as it is to make an appraisal of the amount of influence that the motion pictures have upon other patterns that affect domestic and matrimonial experience outside of what can be more precisely defined as courtship, it is nevertheless certain that they have a part in the shaping of the later adult patterns of behavior, even though there is not the same degree of susceptibility that we find in the young adolescent.

There are four lines of development that deserve study since along each the movies frequently provide dramatic presentation of situations that are highly suggestive. One of these is the often subtle but no less penetrating suggestion of a liberal sex code. If it were possible to untangle the various contributions that are being made to the sophistication of modern youth and the increasing acceptance of sex freedom both before and after marriage, or at least a toleration of ideas of lenient patterns of behavior, we have every reason to suppose that a major influence would prove to be the motion pictures.

The motion pictures are also teachers of marital adjustment. From them has come in no small measure the widespread realiza-

[5] Herbert Blumer, *Movies and Conduct*, chap. III.

tion that there is need of an understanding of the conditions that make for good marital relationship between husband and wife. They have contributed more to the education of women than men, since they have not maintained the discrimination that the folkways previously enforced against the female sex in favor of the masculine. They also have had a part in the greater appreciation of the inherent marriage hazard and the growth of tolerance for divorce. This, however, has necessarily weakened the sense of personal obligation on the part of those who marry, thus encouraging those who meet marital trials to seek divorce, while under a more rigid attitude a greater proportion would find some means of solution.

The fourth of the very influential contributions that the motion pictures have been making to modern life, particularly to American civilization, has been the general trend toward enhancing the status of woman. Not only have the motion pictures catered to the large attendance of women, but their attempt to utilize to the full the drama of modern love-making has forced a portrayal that has been incompatible with a masculine-dominated outlook of life. From this angle they have helped to lift the standard of matrimonial expectation, especially among women, and necessarily this has made modern marriage more difficult. Anyone seeking to find an effective way to destroy the older concept of the inferiority of women would choose the motion pictures as an instrument. Not only do they appeal to great multitudes; in addition, their teaching is conveyed by enchanting entertainment, thus making notions palatable that otherwise might be resisted on account of earlier emotional attitudes.

It is thus obvious that no description of interaction that leaves out the cursory associations made possible by modern invention can realistically present the effective contacts of modern life. The motion pictures do not bring abstract instruction in so far as they modify behavior. They embody their influence in personalities. Men and women who appear on the screens, estimated by their meaning, especially to the adolescent, have as great

contact significance, and sometimes more, than flesh and blood associates both in and out of the family. The actors and actresses become familiar friends, and there is a one-sided relationship which the imagination turns into a genuine fellowship.[6] One young person testifies, "Buddy Rogers and Rudy Valentino have kissed me oodles of times but they don't know it."[7] Then the writer tells us how she rehearsed a love scene while in the atmosphere of a motion picture and as a consequence reacted adversely to her courtship association. Again she reveals a proneness to imitation when she says that she began smoking after watching Dolores Costello, and that this became the means of separating her from her parents.[8]

Contact and courtship interaction

Courtship constitutes a special type of interaction. This is so clear that the observer who comes into the presence of a young couple maintaining such interaction can detect what is taking place even when there is little overt expression of the emotional responses going back and forth. Even the face takes on an expression that one would rarely mistake. The same is true of the conversation, even the very tone of the speaking. There is so much inward pressure, so much readiness for mating among those who have achieved normal adolescence, that the association becomes possessed by emotions ever ready for awakening.

Although distinctive, courtship interaction has a variability ranging from slight interest through flirtation to the final love-dominance that is commonly regarded by those who have traveled out of romance as an emotional intoxication. Those who deal with young people have been forced to recognize that nothing will so disrupt stable patterns of behavior and charge the whole personality with one intense motivation as falling in love. This merely means that courtship interaction tends to

[6] Blumer, *op. cit.*, p. 221.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 223.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 223.

monopolize and intensify in such a way as to make the association a special type of interaction.

In spite of the propensity within the young person, favorable contact has to occur or the inner impulses remain dormant. This means more than the mere meeting together of two young persons of opposite sex. Whether any particular meeting will have power to awaken love depends upon the predisposition, socially constructed, of those so placed that they can establish fellowship. In no life-reaction is there more variability than here.

There are those who are destined to bring their love-cravings into quick fruitage, their preference being slight and their choice made easily from those they happen to know at the age period when romance gets thoroughly under way. Those who have had their erotic needs more refined are made more exacting. Their mating must be highly selective, and whether they marry or not frequently depends upon whether they can widen their acquaintance sufficiently to find during the favorable period a proper candidate for love and marriage. This does not mean that such persons have less drive inwardly than those who marry early and easily.[9] On the contrary, they may be more heavily endowed with the mating propensity, but even so their discrimination may through lack of favorable contact leave them unmarried. Most commonly when this happens their stress of other interests, their enlistment in other sorts of undertaking, makes for sublimation and content. There remains always the possibility, however, that this good adjustment may be invaded by egoistic feelings, the idea that others are noticing and looking askance at the individual who has not married. From this may come conflict, even an underlying current of bitterness through failure to realize that it was the qualitative control of the mating impulse rather than its feebleness that led to the single life. There was no courtship interaction because there was no favorable contact.

[9] R. Austin Freeman, *Social Decay and Regeneration,* pp. 263-264.

Far too often this lack of contact results from nothing more than concentration on the part of the woman who is seeking to train herself for her vocation as thoroughly as would an ambitious man. The period when this is most likely to occur is the very one when courtship is in season, and the consequence is that what is accepted as mere postponement of mate-finding or an indifference due to strong interests along other lines is, in fact, a giving up of opportunity for mating, a final commitment to the single life. The attractions and the demands of higher education sometimes are the causes of a concentration that has kept the mating impulses quiescent or has turned them aside from their purpose. Vocational, urban, and rural isolation are other common explanations of the failure of an individual to develop the favorable contacts that permit courtship interaction.

Family contact a special association

Any contact that brings forth interaction registers as a psychic consolidation of interrelated feelings and ideas. The experience is of the mind, and although held together by its own unique meaning, there is an emphasis of individual happenings from time to time that may be, as recognized in consciousness, predominantly either feeling or ideas. Any contact that stands out as having marked significance is a special association distinguishable by the value it comes to have in comparison with those that are more casual. Of such interactions, that of the family is with rare exceptions supreme in the effect it has upon those held together in intimacy. As is true of other fellowships, that of the home is not constant but is in continuous change. It is also true that although there is a common process of awareness, each individual is not only building notions and realizing the reactions called forth by the others, but also having in greater or less degree, according to temperament and training, realization of the attitudes and ideas held by others toward him. The sentiment or thought that holds the center of consciousness in any individual represents a composition developed by the interplay

of the group as a whole and is not a mere individual reception of group stimuli accepted passively and built into a cluster of psychic values. Nevertheless, the experience itself, as it lives in consciousness, is individual, and in spite of a common partaking of awareness each person has his own collection of emotions and ideas which, however clearly expressed or accurately interpreted by others, cannot have for any other member of the household the unique meaning that it brings to its possessor.

The family does not, therefore, act together to manufacture for all its members a common product of interaction. It may carry the various members of the relationship closer to a sharing of a common emotional sameness of psychic experience than is ever realized elsewhere, but more normally in our culture there is a realization of difference as well as identity which gives the person a separateness as well as the feeling of belonging together. The family, in spite of its peculiar intimacy and, as a rule, its incomparable emotionally laden interactions, does not constitute a social mind, yielding a product that each individual takes over and holds in common with the others.

Nor can the significance of domestic interaction be found merely in the fact that it constitutes a primary association. Face-to-face interactions are as a rule more effective than others. This is not because of the form of the association, but rather because those having such contact are predisposed to react sensitively to the fellowship. As a matter of fact, individuals can come and go within the home and have, equally with the others, primary intimacy without there being any lasting significant response.

The hired worker may live in the household and, although maintaining for a considerable period of time face-to-face contacts, leave with little permanent impression received or made on others. On the other hand, it may be, as was true of the Earl of Shaftesbury, the reverse. The parents may, in comparison with the household employee, bring to the growing child a much less significant relationship. More frequently still, one can find in a family one parent greatly influencing the children or

some of the children although the father and mother have equal opportunity. Nothing can be assumed to be true of the individual family on the basis of any general principle that primary contacts are necessarily significant in the growth of personality. Every setting has to have its unique interpretation because the intimacy itself is unique. Family contact, therefore, is a special association in the sense that it provides an opportunity for face-to-face intimacies that can, and usually in our culture do, most profoundly influence the growing personality and supremely invoke the responses of the adults living together.

The family and the individual

Looked at from its socializing function, the family delivers group patterns of behavior and standards. This it accomplishes by the direction it gives to the interactions that develop in domestic intimacy. This guidance of the action and reaction of persons living together is to a large extent conscious and deliberate. Any analysis of the causal influences that have entered into the making of any personality reveals, however, that a great part of the contribution of the family is unconscious and accidental. A large portion of the habit-life accumulates through the suggestions and examples provided by the parents, especially the mother, and necessarily in this conveyance the average parent in great measure tries to incorporate in the child what was built into his or her own personality. This parental determinism does more than start the child; it chisels out the pathway that the child as he develops is forced to follow, especially emotionally, as one stage of development leads on to another and sets its direction.

It is unfortunate for social progress that this personality-making influence is so seldom within the attention of the parent, and even when it is a conscious influence, so seldom subjected to any intelligent examination. The consequence is that the family rarely is free from what may well be called domestic lag, and social stagnation is prevented merely because the pressure

of social change and the inherent impulses of the adolescent generally bring some break during youth between parental attitudes and traditions and the life-disposition of the older child. Anyone familiar with the problems of youth is constantly made to realize that however forceful and consistent the parents may be in a co-operative effort to guide the child, unless his personality is permitted to have recognition, conflict and cleavage are likely to occur in any personality that is fundamentally aggressive, bringing repudiation of the family program.[10]

The family in its creative interactions, as it molds the personality of the child, has to utilize his potential capacities. He is not provided with a mass of endowments that can be shaped just as the parents desire. What the child brings to the experience of household interactions is his innate individual equipment of body and temperament and intellectual capacity that can be led to express itself in systems of thought, skills of activity, and habits of interest and appreciation. This original composition upon which interaction must work is not separated into unrelated mind and body but is an elaborate complexity which for the purpose of understanding has to be analyzed in its various components from skeleton to imagination. It provides the basis for the total personality but only as it gives over to the socializing experiences the native potentialities of the individual. Whether the family recognizes its limitations or not, as it tries to bring the child into harmonious relationship with its purposes, it is in fact forced to accept the barriers that the original endowment brings.

The interaction of parents and children is a creative process, but only in the sense of making possible the growth of the child that brings to expression the innate characteristics. This means that parent and child, as soon as the latter attains any degree of individuality, are forced into action and reaction rather than any mere pouring of influence into the child from the parent so as to give the latter the power of destiny over his offspring. In this relationship we find two extreme reactions

10 William Healy, *Personality in Formation and Action*, pp. 141-143.

on the part of the child—imitation, which is a wholehearted effort to follow the parent, and opposition, which is an attack on the power of the parent which the child resents. Between these two simon-pure reactions we have a quantity of interactions that are indifferent in meaning or are mixtures rather than unadulterated imitation or recoil.

The child's attitude, when looked at as a general trend rather than as it appears in any particular moment of reaction, is clearly discordant and inconsistent. It is ambivalent in that it both moves toward and away from parental purposes; although never consistent, this variability of children forbids that we should assume among them any standard disposition since some children accept much and rebel little while others do the opposite. The analysis of character reveals how consequential this ambivalent element in the life may be. Healy, for example, tells us of the child of fourteen, emaciated from undernourishment, whose predicament was explained by divided allegiance to the mother. While in the habit of thanking God in prayer for her unselfish mother, she was also feeling a deep sense of disapproval of the parent, whom she regarded as essentially selfish. The child recovered as soon as the mother let her give free expression to her hatred.[11] This is an extreme case, but the ambivalent attitude is commonplace. It would be strange, indeed, if the child, charged as he is with egoistic impulses, accepted without emotional recoil and hostility the authority the home brings as personified by those under whose unwelcomed management he from time to time finds himself.

One of the consequences of this clashing is the awakening of the child to his own purposes and a corresponding realization on the part of the parent or person who has assumed authority over the child that the latter has a will of his own. Through such interaction the family individualizes as well as socializes. Childhood provides the time and circumstances when these actions and reactions have their profoundest effects. It, however,

[11] Healy, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-97.

does not maintain a monopoly since the family setting is prolific in the opportunities it brings for those expressions of the contrariety of persons that sharpens the feeling of selfness. Adolescence, early marriage adjustment, pregnancy, childbirth, and financial difficulties are some of the other crisis experiences that issue in individualizing interactions.

Although these experiences of self striking self occur in the family, it must not be forgotten that there is always a significant cultural milieu in which the family functions. An American is likely to understand and smile at Allport's example of the little boy, not yet three, making a daily visit to his grandmother's across the street to tell her for no apparent reason "I won't." But the same story would probably puzzle an orthodox Chinese, Japanese, or American Indian parent.[12]

Family interaction individualizes not alone through these collisions of self with self; there is also a realization of personality through the growth that goes on with the interactions. The person comes to possess himself through the give-and-take of fellowship. This is not confined to the family, but again the home has the first and greatest chance to awaken self-consciousness. The individual comes to know himself as a by-product of his knowledge of others, their designs and attitudes. He cannot partake of the flow of domestic conversation, activities, and expectations without reacting with feelings that belong to himself and help him develop the realization of independent personality. This awakening is clearer when it is interpreted in relation to the general movement of the child toward integration, since, in spite of contradictory trends, the personality is attempting so to shape itself as to achieve a unity of purpose, a central course of character, something relatively stable and persistent. The acquiring of individualization accompanies this growth of self-consolidation, which is best described as integration. The growing child's progressive attainment of personality echoes inwardly in feelings that bring him the self-consciousness of individuality.

[12] G. W. Allport, *Personality: Its Psychological Interpretation*, p. 165.

The individual in the family setting

The child enters the family not only as a distinct, individual personality, potential to be sure, and slowly taking form, but he also comes with a placement that is as distinctive as his resources for self-development. The family meets him with an attitude not given any other. His place in the domestic setting is reserved, and it can be occupied by no other. This means that he has an individual assignment even before his own inherent personality characteristics take shape. It is not, however, that his position is necessarily deliberate, clearly recognized, commonly acknowledged, or consistently upheld. Such a uniformity and settlement would be alien to the spirit of a complex, familial environment. On the contrary, every conceivable diversity is to be found, unless the family functions in a cultural setting that checks this natural variability. Even in simple social groups, the trained investigator who becomes familiar with concrete domestic situations finds that finality and uniformity of placement do not exist. Instead there is evidence of the influence of the personal idiosyncrasies of the various family members as it affects placement. Then always there is a wide range of adaptability to an existent domestic placement.

Although personality is not something that is stamped out in uniform patterns of behavior by family contact as it acts effectively in the parent-child relationship, there is in the first stages of the child's growth the beginning of personality formation, a product of original potential characteristics on the one side and a fashioning environmental setting on the other. Personality is never a passive reflection of home influences but something that starts developing in an environment where domestic interactions are the chief if not the exclusive stimuli. During this growth each stage that stands out as a distinct period in the life-career is related to the one preceding,[18] so that the dominance of the family at the start gives the home the strategic control over the personality-making process.

[18] Allport, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

Family association and inward response

The awakening of self-knowledge brings social sensitiveness. Indeed, the two acquirements go on together, the child becoming more conscious of himself and of others through the interactions that stimulate this growth of self-consciousness. The increasing realization of the social environment, especially as it brings forth emotional responses to the attention and love of the mother and father, tends to turn the ego-life of the child toward identification with one or both parents. This is one of the strongest factors in the making of the child's personality and undoubtedly explains a great deal of the similarity of parent and child which is ordinarily charged to inheritance.[14] The child, because he is eager for security and social approval in his love fellowship with his parent, makes a tremendous effort to copy those characteristics of the parent that draw his attention. The interactions that occur in the comradeship of the two are charged with intense meaning, especially on the part of the imitating child, with the consequence that they enter deeply into the formation of the personality that is being built out of the potential endowments.

This child-parent relationship is not only inevitable in the normal ongoing of the child toward an adult career but also highly dramatic in the expressions it takes and the intense values frequently brought forth by it. It is always a danger to the child and perhaps the supreme temptation of the parent. Nevertheless, its absence is nothing less than a catastrophe since the child, denied love-alliance with some adult, suffers from social malnutrition as his personality takes form. Every conceivable variation occurs. There are favorite children and strong partiality on the part of the child for one parent as compared with the other. There is rivalry between children because each seeks to be superior in his identification with one or both parents. There is also frequently the shock to the child who in some period of development repudiates his homage, even his attach-

[14] Healy, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

ment to the parent, or switches from one to the other. This process of breaking away may go forward gradually with no violent reaction on the part of either child or parent. On the contrary there may be an attempt by the parent to identify himself with the child and use the career of the latter in the attempt to relive his own life through the experiences of his offspring.

In the family each individual reacts to each member in a mutual relationship. This association, in which each responds to the other in a back-and-forth exclusive interaction, constantly vitalizes the feeling both of contact and of separation. The situation of the two persons likewise is in continous change. At least this is the general trend, with great differences in the specific home as to the length of time that there is a stable situation. Along with this fluctuation there is also the reaction of each individual toward groupings within the family life, whenever he responds to the interactions that are carried on by a temporary alliance of two or more members of the family who have for the moment a common viewpoint or a common interest. In the modern home this is often the clashing of one against the opinion or desire of others who for the moment have spontaneously joined together in opposition. These alliances come and go, often being formed to meet a temporary situation, such as the one frequently resulting from an attempt to coerce some other member of the family.

Then there is the interaction of the individual as he responds to the total family program. This often seems to him to be an alliance of the other members against himself. It may, however, take a different form and be a reaction to the sense of family unity, family reputation, family position, in which there is a fading away of the feeling of personal differences and in its place the idealization of the family as a self-conscious, unified association. This reaction may be invoked by some calamity the family suffers, an attack on its integrity from outside itself, or by the ambition of one member of the family, which the others attempt to support.

Family association and outward response

Each member living within the framework of the family also reacts to people with whom he has contact outside the home. Invariably this means that his interactions take on a dual aspect, since he is conscious in his actions and reactions of his twofold interests. If this is designated as compound interaction to distinguish it from the mutual back-and-forth relationships of ordinary association, it is easy to see what complications can arise. The reacting personality may carry over into his outside life the attitudes engendered by family conditions, with no sense of the need of modification or adaptation, and thereby find himself badly adjusted to someone who does not share his domestic background. In contrast with this he may find himself in emotional confusion because he is conscious of the great difference between family habits and sentiments and those expressed by persons who have had a different bringing up or who have reacted differently to what their parents provided.

This compound interaction is by no means confined to members of the family. The same situation arises whenever anyone identified with a closely knit group goes from it to have contact with persons who do not belong and are not in sympathy with it. The family, however, most commonly illustrates this situation because the individual normally is born in a home and is saturated with its atmosphere and practices. The primacy in time that the family generally possesses, which permits it to bring its influences so deeply into the growing personality, also means that the individual is most frequently made conscious during childhood or youth of the incompatibility or at least the dissimilarity of the family and the nonfamily associations. He therefore has thrown upon him the burden of coming to some settlement in his interactions, and not seldom this becomes an attempt on his part to maintain a program of fundamental dualism. He acts in one way within the family and in another when he is outside its intimacies. A wide opening is made in such reactions for the appearance of individual characteristics. The

greater the difference between the family and the nonfamily groups, the more demanding and difficult the individual finds his position. His sensitiveness to the reaction of others, both in the family and outside, and his feeling of loyalty, weak or strong, also have much to do with determining whether he has to make a great or an insignificant commitment to the one or the other environment as he shapes his life-program.

The member of the family may also find himself acting in concert with other members in similar responses to out-of-family persons or groups of persons. This especially comes about when there is within the family a feeling of attack from outside or when the family, in order to accomplish some design of which all the members approve, seeks to enlist the interest of nonmembers or to destroy their opposition. This feeling that one is reacting as a representative of the family group often comes to consciousness in the early period of childhood. The child undertakes the role of being a champion of domestic interest with a personification not only of his domestic ideals but also of a family unity which may have existence only in his own mind, and which comes from his thinking that he speaks or acts for all his home associates, whom he supposes to be in agreement with him. The family sometimes finds itself rather awkwardly placed because an enthusiastic inexperienced member has taken on a crusade for what he supposes to be an obligation to his home. These interactions, when first they occur, however trivial they seem in content and significance from an adult's point of view, are always big with possibility in their effect upon the growing personality. They constitute highly emotionalized interactions not to be lightly regarded by thoughtful parents.

Culture plays a great part in all the interactions that come from family association and outward responses. A stable society, possessing such firmly established folkways and mores that only slight and simple adaptations are required, lessens the risk of conflict between the family and nonfamily interests and persons. Such collisions, when they occur, are also more easily handled by the individuals and are not likely to leave consequential emo-

tional sediments that become an abiding constituent of the personality. On the other hand, a rapidly flowing cultural stream, bringing swift change and requiring radical departures from former social routine in order to make imperative adaptations, augments the situations that make conscious the differences between one's family and others or between the family as a union of fellowship and the prevailing feelings and standards of the social group in which the family finds itself. The individual family may be in advance or it may be behind the general consensus, and in either case opportunity is provided for domestic self-consciousness and sensitivity on the part of any member of the family group. Every variation of consequence also can occur. There may be stubborn resistance, domestic self-complacency, bewilderment, shame, or hostility, as the family in its interactions feels its peculiarity in contrast with its social environment.

The results of these collisions are, however, much more impressive to the individual, especially during his formative years, than to the group as a whole, and the effects of these experiences must be sought in the influences they have upon the shaping of each member of the home as he stands forth as a separate personality. The literature of social experience constantly portrays life-careers that have been turned to antisocial feelings and practices because the child, caught in the clash of the family and nonfamily habits and standards, has not been able to make satisfactory settlement of the differences that he has recognized with strong feeling.

The interacting family and its cultural setting

Whether the family is interpreted as a unity attempting to react to the out-of-home social environment or whether attention is given to the behavior of a particular member of the household, there is need always of remembering that the family does not exist in a social vacuum. However independent, original, and isolated it seems, nevertheless it always carries on in a cultural frame. This means that no home can be understood if

taken by itself and no attention given to its setting. This framework within which the family as a special group has its life is not simple, as we find it among any people of whom we now have knowledge. For example, the aborigines of western Australia,[15] in their relatively primitive situation, maintained an elaborate system of mating and of marriage relationships. The trend of modern life, however, has been to increase the multiplicity of the social pressures that come out of the environment and penetrate and influence the family.

Any description of domestic life must therefore take account of the social setting. In our time this demands not only regard for culture in the large sense, the characteristics that distinguish one national group from another, but also recognition of innumerable variations that express the effects of sectional, of rural, urban, and village conditions, of class and economic circumstances, religious background, connections through marriage, family reputation, and so forth. Even the place where the family dwells may have meaning, because it qualifies the interactions of the family and its members. The expression, "the right side of the tracks," gives testimony to this fact. The term has entered the language because it shows the personal experiences and prejudices of those who have come to realize how socially important it is to live in the right part of the town.

Even the time-sense of the family must be taken into account in any attempt to understand it. Any particular family may live in the past, or, more rarely, in the future, to such an extent as to create tension for itself or at least for some of its sensitive members who feel the difference between its atmosphere and that of the outside social group. If it is difficult for the individual to be modern,[16] it is tenfold more trying, except in communities where the individuality of families is covered up by secondary contacts, for the home to attempt to adapt to the future even when it seems near at hand.

[15] B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, chap. II.

[16] C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, chap. X.

It helps in appreciating the situation of the family to think of it in an analogy and to compare its position with that of a cell of the body. The cell has its own life and its own function. It also lives within the greater body and is dependent upon not only the physiological processes that touch it closely but also the general vitality of the organism as a whole.

The cultural environment in which an individual family has been placed influences all the major features of domestic experience. Childbirth and pregnancy, child care and training, courtship, engagement, marriage conditions and ceremony, marital and domestic adjustment, divorce, each must be interpreted according to its meaning in a specific cultural setting. All that exists independently is a word, the term for a family occurrence, the description of which must be concrete, gaining its meaning from the cultural background of time and place. This, of course, makes discussion of family life more difficult, since the greater the abstraction, the farther away the interpretation gets from the realities of domestic life. Specific features are open to statistical measurement so that it is possible, for example, to compare the number of divorces in the United States in a given year to the number in Japan; but useful as this is, the student must keep in mind that there is considerable difference in the domestic meaning of the two statements when each is interpreted in its own cultural setting. The social significance of terminating marriage by divorce procedure is not the same in one country as in another. Domestic events cannot be understood unless they are related to the culture in which they occur.

The composition of the family greatly influences its habit traits. As the make-up of the individual family changes, its characteristic routine also has to change. There are in present cultural trends two major tendencies that affect the composition of the home and thereby the interactions that take place within it. One is the delay of marriage among a portion of the middle class due to educational ambition and the difficulty of getting economically established so as to permit marriage. This brings matrimonial adjustment at a later age and at a higher maturity

level than is preferred. As a consequence both the man and woman are likely to enter domestic experience with a relatively firmer habit-life that has been created during the period that they remained unmarried. They have been forced not merely to postpone marriage but to attempt some degree of conscious adaptation to the conditions of the single life. Thus they stand in contrast with those who have moved from youth rapidly toward marriage and who have never regarded their courtship period as anything other than a prelude to the establishment of a home. If children are born to those who have been forced to postpone marriage for any considerable period, conditions arise that influence the interaction of the parent and the child. When the latter, for example, arrives at adolescence his parents have moved closer to old age and are not so easily sympathetic to youthful reactions as would have been true if marriage had occurred earlier. Even though great differences in the relationships of the individual child and parent have to be recognized, the interactions within the family as a rule show the influence of a parenthood that first came relatively late in life. As the years accumulate, social disposition as well as the organism itself tends toward a conservative disposition, and this easily may be expressed in habits that seem alien to the child or young person who is overcharged with energy, and therefore in a different mood than the parent.

The resources of modern science also are changing the composition of the population as the proportion of the aged increases. This relative shifting in the age distribution of the population influences both social and domestic habits. A country predominantly young and one increasingly aged do not have the same outlook, and as a consequence a similar contrast appears in social habit. It is not, however, until this trend toward a greater proportion of older people is related to the intimacies of personal relationships within the family that we discover its emotional meaning in interaction. The habit-life of the family reflects its composition, and frequently this means conflict between the interests of the old and the interests of the child. It is not, of

course, a new problem, but it is one that is intensified by the trend toward greater emotional distance between the old and the young as a result of modern conditions. Indeed, the habit-life of the individual family may be influenced in a great many ways by this present population trend toward a greater proportion of aged people. The development of family adjustment into a routine, for example, is complicated by industrial conditions that so decidedly favor those who have not reached the age when employment discrimination starts. Much of the life of every family must jelly into habit, but in this process the composition of each particular home constantly operates. Family habit in modern life is thus from time to time called upon to make drastic adjustments—adjustments more radical than those normally occurring in the habit career of the individual adult.

The family a social habit

Many of the interactions of family life come to have a set routine and take on the character of social habit. Children who are introduced to such practices frequently have characteristic emotional reactions or meaningful interactions, while adults unaccustomed to the following of the program are apt to find a minimum of significance in what they do in accordance with the domestic system. The opposite is, however, occasionally true. Then we recognize that there has been a long-continued smoldering protest as the adult breaks forth in some sort of rebellious repudiation of a part of the domestic program. Thus interactions turn away from what has seemed to be a firmly established and generally approved formula of behavior and lose their automatic character as domestic habits.

Domestic security through mutual meaning

Domestic interaction provides the opportunity for one of the chief supports of the family. Those who are in contact with one another may progress in their relationship through the

meaning each takes on as a result of their life together. Even on the lowest level of male-female stimulus and response this takes place. Without it sex relationships are meager because they have no means of gathering an increase of emotional content, and a permanent relationship even on the physical plane requires this development. The male finds a meaning in his mate, a product of emotional reciprocity that holds them more firmly together. This is even more true of the female.

It is, however, on the husband-wife plane that this mutual meaning through interaction contributes most to domestic security. Each of the two persons in the fellowship finds in the other more and more meaning, and as a result their union is the better welded. Much of this is unconscious, not recognized except when illness or separation or death leaves the other realizing how much he or she depended upon the partner in the domestic adventure. The same progress is offered the parent and child in their responses to one another. This is frequently a great surprise to the mother or father who has not anticipated the significance the offspring would continuously gain. Instead of the child's reaching a stationary value in the life of the parent, the years with their changes deepen and extend this meaning. The same sort of thing can happen in the child's reaction to the parent. The child's changes, however, are more radical in quality as well as quantity than is true of the parent's reaction to the child. At least this is the normal development, for without it the child cannot grow up, and in that case the meaning that the parent has is unprogressive, mere repetition of what was true in the child's earliest years.

There is also a gathering of meaning between the spouses because of their parenthood. The wife becomes more to her husband because she is the mother, and the husband becomes increasingly significant because he is the father. These interactions are the natural consequences of domestic life. They may, however, for various reasons not take place or, having started, become fixed; or the meaning already acquired may even be lost. Much of the security of the family depends upon the

normal increase of this mutual meaning. The inability of some to go forward, their clinging to the earlier stages of interaction, their lack of inherent capacity for domestic development explains their failure as husbands, wives, parents, and children. Obviously, disaster in this relationship of individuals tied together in domestic interaction is so determining as to put an end to the stability and value of the individual family, at least for one or more of those concerned. Recovery is exceedingly difficult since what has been lost is the one thing most necessary for a renaissance of affection and relationship. Prevention here is enormously fruitful, but curative efforts, on the other hand, most discouraging. No service for the family is more promising than that which prepares husband and wife to grow in meaning for each other through their interaction, and to give an atmosphere to their home that leads to the same sort of progress in the parent-child association.

The domestic ideal

It is generally recognized that every living thing by the mere fact of its existence bears witness to the adjustment it is successfully maintaining through struggle. It is not so widely realized that the personality likewise is developed through striving[17] and that its continuation requires a never-ending capacity for a social adjustment that easily assumes the intensity of conflict. Human nature shies away from this fact and seeks ideals that are essentially static. This disposition especially shows itself in domestic and marital idealism. Young people are even made to believe that they can become prepared for marriage and family responsibilities by verbally accepting notions of abstract virtues, such as unselfishness and sacrifice, as the proper goals of their effort rather than learning to make concrete, realistic adjustment to the circumstances and personalities that confront them. As a consequence, the meaning of domestic maturity is unappreciated and good endeavor misdirected. Anxiety arises because there is

[17] C. G. Jung, *The Integration of the Personality*, p. 27.

a failure to realize how necessary and how valuable a degree of struggle is in the relationships of family contacts, especially between husband and wife in the first period of married life. The indispensable means of personality growth and deepening of affection is misunderstood and even regarded as evidence of failure.

Domestic life cannot safely be static. Its ideal is not stationary but progressive experience. Struggle in some measure characterizes this part of life just as it does every other form of life. Struggle can by its quality and quantity become a menace, but this is because the form it takes and the strength it develops reveal the inability of those in trouble to make the adjustments necessary for successful living together.

The test of marriage or family life is not nearness to or distance from verbal standards or ideal definitions, but the satisfactions brought to those in fellowship and the social consequences of their living together. Nothing is more individual or relative than domestic experience. It requires an adjustment that can never reach a final goal even though its continuing year after year leads to its own changing as accepted routine, increased tolerance, and greater understanding affect the form it takes.

XIV. *Emotional Characteristics of Family Experience*

MEANING OF EMOTION. There is, and for some time to come there is likely to continue to be, controversy as to the nature of human emotions.[1] In spite of various schools of thought, uncompromising in their interpretations of this aspect of psychological experience, there is a considerable agreement that can be made the basis of an analysis of the emotional significance of family experience.[2] The concept "emotion" signifies for all psychologists and psychiatrists a psychic composite.[3] This means that, however it is regarded as to its origin in its functional expression, it represents an accumulation reflecting the life-career of the individual. It is also clearly, as to purpose, a means of adjustment of the individual to an environment, something that must be thought of not as distinct from action but a particular type of the person's response to the situation in which he finds himself.

The emotion comes into existence as a result of the person's contact with some object or event in his environment. This response process, however, cannot be understood without taking account in its fullest sense of the existing biological background of the person. This means not merely that there is in all psychic experience a physiological accompaniment, the interpretation of which at present divides psychological thought, but a more significant physical predisposition toward a definite emotional

[1] M. L. Reynert, ed., *Feelings and Emotions, The Wittenburg Symposium.*

[2] An excellent discussion of the various theories of the origin and meaning of emotion may be found in J. K. Folsom's *Social Psychology*, pp. 36-55.

[3] L. L. Bernard, *Introduction to Social Psychology*, p. 161.

reaction than is true in other psychic experiences. The reaction, for example, in a person to an object causing anger may require for its understanding diagnosis of readiness for irritability associated with high blood pressure in the individual as well as the defining of the element in the environment that provoked wrath. It is this subjective aspect of emotional experience, always intimately associated with body states, that distinguishes the emotion as a process of adjustment from other activities.

In any case, the significance of the environmental object to which the person responds emotionally cannot be understood except by finding out what reactions take place in the person and are reported back to consciousness. When traced in this fashion, any emotional response to an out-of-the-self situation is found to cause various body changes that have as their biologic purposes the reinforcement of a behavior toward which the personality is impelled. However, when we observe someone else expressing an emotion which we do not share, such as anger, for example, we find that ordinarily the adult, and in lesser degree the child, could not carry his impulses in a straightforward manner to the appropriate activity and that instead there is a diffusion which we interpret as the emotion. We say, he was enraged and he struck the man that he felt had insulted him, for attention concentrates on the feeling that accompanies this particular violent reaction. This predominates in consciousness and thus becomes in our thinking the essential meaning of the person's emotion.

It is generally recognized that family intimacy is highly emotional in the sense that it provides occasions for stirring up the sort of responses to environment that have this characteristic of strong feeling. It is true that the home provides favorable conditions for strong personal reactions and that it also serves as a place of expression for emotions that are caused elsewhere. Fear, anger, and love are basic, specific emotions, that appear frequently within the home. We, however, use the term "emotional" in a wider meaning, emphasizing the prevalence in the home of acts that portray considerable feeling as distin-

guished from more neutral activity. This is so true it is generally taken for granted that domestic fellowship is in large degree emotional, providing both intense satisfactions and tremendous unhappiness.

We know also that there are great differences in the tendency of persons to have emotional reactions to environmental conditions and that what we think of as emotional instability usually appears more freely within the privacy of the home than elsewhere, and also that it, so far as we can trace its causation in any particular life-career, appears chiefly as a product of inherited physical characteristics and the social influences that come forth from family experience. From early childhood the home environment may have directed the individual toward habit-growths that have become fundamental emotional traits of his personality. In nonpsychological language we can say that the family tends to have associated with it the stirring of profound personal reactions that we can best describe as emotional experiences. This aspect of domestic fellowship is so important in understanding the function of the family that it needs special consideration, but it is not something peculiar to family life, since wherever we have closeness of association we find this same tendency toward emotionalism.

Emotions as life-responses

The emotions are not by-products of the individual's attempt to adjust to life, but are one aspect of the process. Not only do they come into being as an attempt to respond to a situation, but they are contributions, made possible by biological endowment and psychical experience, to the effort of the person to meet the circumstances that confront him. Even this statement becomes misleading if emotions are thought of as something that functions as an accompaniment of the behavior rather than as an integral part of it. Even the terms we use to distinguish different sorts of emotions are not names of entities but merely

the means of verbal classification of various reactions to situations that, broadly described, have common features and can therefore be catalogued as fear, anger, jealousy, and the like. The realities that these words represent are particular, not only in the sense that they are possessions of a unique personality that cannot be shared by another as genuine conscious experience; but even in the career of the individual, they are specific responses to an existing situation and are, therefore, not duplicated.

When we seek to appraise that part of a personality which we call the emotional, we soon discover that this cannot be understood unless it is thought of as a life-disposition. The whole person enters into the emotional aspect of behavior in the same way that it appears in thinking or in action. This means that we are interested not so much in the upheavals, the emotional outbursts that appear from time to time, as in the underlying emotional characteristics of the individual. The significant emotional character cannot be found in isolated peaks but in the more extensive plateau where from time to time summits lift themselves above the general level. The emotional upheavals find their meaning only when interpreted as to their significance in the whole-self response to life.[4]

The dramatic nature of strongly expressed emotions draws attention, but there has to be a wider survey of the personality to get at the meaning of these experiences, since they cannot be safely interpreted unless recognition is made of the conditions that invoke them, both outward and inward, so that there has to be consideration not only of the environment but even more of the personality that is struggling to bring about adjustment. The key position in this complexity of survival-reaction is held by the personality itself, and in any effort to discover this we are forced to find and understand the characteristic and basic emotional mood.

Since it is useless to interpret an outburst of anger, fear, or

[4] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, p. 65.

jealousy, unless the total personality reacting is taken into account, efforts to understand the emotional aspects of conduct lead the investigator of any specific career backward into the formative period[5] of the individual to the time when the family possessed almost a monopoly of the influences that worked to harden into shape the emotional disposition of the person. Important as the home is, it does not, however, have an exclusive control of the emotion-fashioning influences, since, for example, the organism itself, a product of inheritance as well as of environmental conditions, plays a major part in the building of the individual's emotional life-disposition. The family has, however, a large role in the originating forces that operate to make this disposition, not only because the family provides the means of nurture and training but also because of the penetration that the interactions within the home have and their effectiveness as the emotional character takes form.

Childhood is so predominantly emotional that it would give us a better idea of the development of the child if stages of growth were distinguished by emotional age rather than according to the arbitrary classifying by years.[6] It is the emotional progress more than the taking on of intellectual content that marks the event of the child's breaking away from infancy and going on toward adult independence. If the significance of emotional age were more generally appreciated, both the parent and the school could make more conscious effort to recognize it in the working out of their programs.

It is now possible, as the psychoanalytic study of human conduct demonstrates, for an individual to have formal education stressing intellectual content extending from the kindergarten to the highest degree given by the university, with so little emotional development that the personality continues at an emotional level that became stationary in childhood, making successful adjustment to the adult world impossible. Such a

[5] Phyllis Blanchard, "Reading Disabilities in Relation to Difficulties of Personality and Emotional Development," *Mental Hygiene*, 20:384-413.

[6] Reynert, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

person's lack of emotional maturity may be camouflaged through prudence and therefore be not so evident as the incapacity of the child, but when tested by exacting circumstances the emotional responses prove themselves to be in quality what we rightly expect during the early years of childhood. The education received has afforded concealment of the emotional retardation, but it has failed to stimulate emotional progress.

The emotions as social adjustments

The emotions represent merely an aspect of the larger process of adjustment to life. Their test is the same as that which we make of the process taken as a whole. The emotional reaction finds its justification in its usefulness. The moment, however, that we make this valuation we find that the greatest difficulty in the attempts to adjust to life is in the emotions. This is largely due to the fact that the emotions have remained more primitive as the social situation has changed and are, therefore, less adaptable even than thought. The explanation in large measure is that the body is prepared to respond to the emotions with definite behavior that under other circumstances was distinctly useful in the survival processes but that frequently in modern civilization brings penalty rather than advantages in attemps to adjust to a total situation.[7] The endocrine responses in fear or anger, for example, impressively reveal body aspects of strong emotion that frequently have no adequate outlet because of barriers to their original function and therefore bring about inner disturbance and nervous wastage instead of the direct, effective response to the situation that originally was a customary accompaniment of the specific emotion, the one-time usefulness of which in a more primitive cultural setting has become a handicap, especially since there is now so much inward feeling and so little of the outward action which the body changes were developed to reinforce.

[7] George Crile, *Diseases Peculiar to Civilization.*

This strong feeling, generated in the storm and stress of some provocative environmental situation, may, in view of what follows as behavior, become an excessive response. As a consequence the emotion blocks rather than furthers good adjustment. Under such circumstances the emotion becomes harmful rather than helpful, but this is because the organic pattern fails to fit the social necessities, chiefly cultural in origin, that the angry, fearful, or jealous individual has to meet. It is in this unadaptability to the situation at hand that we can distinguish the abnormal from the normal reaction.[8] Subjective interpretation may take possession of the experience and become a chronic habit of expectation, so that without any outside occasion for the development of the emotion that the individual may read into the experience, he may reconstruct the meaning of events and conditions, and thereby become captive to self-created emotions. This type of morbidity appears, for example, in the phobias.[9]

In contrast with this overbalancing of inward states of consciousness we have the opposite predominance of external circumstances. This results in cultural determination. The individual has to cope with circumstances that stand solid against his desires and purposes, and his adjustment is primarily that of reconstruction of attitude. This requires the putting aside of his own desires and making his adjustment an objective adaptation at the expense of subjective values. This he cannot do without emotional disturbance that may go so far as to bring about a temporary conflict, a division of energy, part of which comes forth in activity that attempts to achieve in some measure adaptation to the environmental pressure while at the same time there is an inward opposition that spends itself in a futile emotional outbreak.

There is no time in life when this dramatic recoil against culturally determined circumstances appears so clearly as in

[8] Milton Harrington, *The Biological Approach to the Problem of Abnormal Behavior*, p. 332.

[9] A. J. Rosanoff, *Manual of Psychiatry in Mental Hygiene*, p. 64.

childhood. Since the home is for most children the first distributor of cultural control, it is there that we see again and again during the period of growth the collision between the purposes of the self and the demands of the environment that is so provocative of intense emotional disturbance. These upheavals have a prominent place in the interactions of parent and child as the personality of the latter is gradually taking its fundamental form, particularly in the shaping of the emotional disposition that will characterize the person during adult life.

The home also, as a later discussion will develop in greater detail, provides freedom for emotional habits and thus offers opportunity to those predisposed for such reactions to express emotions that have no utility as adjustment other than by the discharge of pent-up frustrations. This may even carry individuals to the point of using the family as a refuge from reality, a means of escape from cultural determination; and since two or more persons are involved, there may be every possible combination, ranging from one attacking the others who are trying purposefully to adjust to existing circumstances to the tacit agreement of all members of the household to use the home as an arena for the expression of self-feeling, with the least possible attempt to face and deal with the persistence of unpleasant social circumstances. Thus the home may become a hazard, turning the emotions more and more away from their proper function, until their significance is found rather in their obstructing than in their advancing good adjustment to life.

Domestic interaction is a good example of the importance of the selective background of an emotion. The breaking forth of a strong emotion is not a result of an alliance of inward and outward conditions, a mere summation of self-originating responses to environmental stimuli. Instead of this, the experience is a selection of elements in the situation to which the individual is reacting, and it is this choice of attention that provides the meaning and causes the emotional upheaval. This subjective interpretation which comes from the character of

the personality, the individual's previous history and development, assigns the significance that is attached to the elements of the situation which occasioned the emotion.

The more primitive the reaction—that is, the closer it is to an animal's instinctive response, as in a panic, for example—the less strong is the influence of the previous career. But even in moments when fear arises from recognition of great danger, the effects of the preceding life-development appear. Caught in a fire in a theater, the child or adult well-trained to meet this emergency would show greater self-control and better judgment than had he never been given this preparedness.

Domestic emotion cannot be understood from its strength nor by the direction in which it moves in any specific occurrence. If separated from the totality of each personality involved in the interaction, it may seem ridiculously out of proportion. In any case, as an abstracted, isolated experience it cannot be adequately understood. Its significance is historic rather than momentary, and cannot be gathered by an analysis that fails to take into account earlier experience. This is true even when the physical organism is a large contributor to the reaction. The awakening of the specific emotional expression and the turn it takes cannot be explained by the nervous state of the body alone, for even when there is physical preparedness for the experience, there is still a selection that determines when it shall come and what form it takes. Similar inner strain also can be differently discharged in emotions, depending upon the traits of the personality.

The significance of domestic attitude

It is necessary, in any effort to get at the cause of an emotion as it is brought into being by stimuli, to give attention to the background. For example, the mere appearance of great fear does not necessarily demonstrate that there is a genuine state of danger which the individual faces. Nothing more is necessary to generate the emotion than that the person interpret his situ-

ation as one of extreme hazard. A similar selection is frequently illustrated by jealousy within the family. There may be no basis for the emotion, as was true in Shakespeare's classic example of Othello, but if there is a predisposition to find it, the most trivial occurrences may be accepted as the best evidence of what is both dreaded and expected. Behind such an inclination there is, as a rule, a basic fear, a chronic lack of confidence, which of course has become a personality trait, a product of a development reaching back into childhood. Former experiences have created the readiness to feel jealousy[10] until there is no escape from the supersensitiveness to the stimuli that have been chosen and interpreted so as to invoke the emotion.

This preparedness for a specific emotion also carries with it an indifference to evidence that would lead to a contrary reaction. The individual is made blind to the objective meaning of an environmental situation because he is so charged with subjective inclination to read particular meanings into the experience. Such a habit easily becomes a constant source of tension within the family, since the member under scrutiny has no defense but is at the mercy of the imagination of the spouse or parent or child who insists on recasting household happenings and gathering proof of disloyalty, discrimination, or whatever form of suspicion or hostility has become a constant fountain of strong emotion.

This predisposition may best be described as attitude. The intimacies of family life provide favorable conditions for this readiness to select the stimuli that will provoke deeply established habits of emotional responses. These domestic attitudes play an important part in both family happiness and incompatibility. The attitude is anticipatory and over any considerable period of time not only predisposes its possessor but tends to bring out from others automatic, habitual reactions. Thus the attitude may draw from those who are aware of it the best or

[10] David M. Levy, *Studies in Sibling Rivalry*. Sybil Foster, "A Study of the Personality Make-up and Social Setting of Fifty Jealous Children," *Mental Hygiene*, 11:53-77.

the worst of their personality traits. In the former case the attitude becomes a continuous investment, and its dividends are shared by all the members of the household. In the latter case the attitude encourages the development of what at first may not exist except in the imagination of him or her who insists on misreading the conduct of others. Since a neutral disposition cannot be brought by adults, in view of their past experience, into the relationship of marriage or of parenthood, the character of the attitudes that belong to each member of familial interaction becomes one of the most important factors in determining the failure or success of the individual family.

The nature of the attitude, the fact that it is a culmination of a character-development that has grown during the formative period of the personality as a result of subjective selection of stimuli, makes any effort to solve a bad domestic situation difficult. The mere giving of information, even the attempt to lead a person into greater insight, meets with stubborn resistance because, constituted emotionally as the individual is, he cannot see any element in his domestic environment against which he recoils as it actually exists, but only as it is reconstructed by his emotional predisposition. Marital and family problems, therefore, cannot be severed from the greater total-life adjustment of which they are but a part. It is here that domestic counseling meets with its most serious handicap. The counselor has to concern himself with the personalities involved rather than with the specific problem presented, and must bring about a change in their character or fail in his effort.

The morbid attitude

The prominent part that subjective interpretation takes in the emotional attitude explains the necessity of watching out for an abnormal reaction. The emotional state can be so powerful and so utterly disconnected with reality that it demonstrates clearly psychopathic disorder and therefore needs to be distinguished from a normal emotional response however strong and

biased. No realistic analysis of emotional behavior within the home can leave out the possibility of the psychotic individual's becoming a burden and a menace to the individual family because of unsound attitudes.

It is rare that a family is prepared in such cases to understand that the excessive or utterly unfounded emotionalism of one of its members is a product of mental disease and that its victim is irresponsible. It is still more rare, as the mentally sick person begins to show the variations from his previously characteristic conduct that are destined to move toward full development in an insanity, for the family to appreciate that the trouble-making outbursts are symptoms of a growing abnormality. Instead the members of the family react to the attitude of its mentally sick individual as they have previously responded to his one-time normal attitudes. It would save families much suffering and occasionally protect them from great tragedies if there could be an earlier realization that the exaggerated attitude of its mentally ill member is a transition from responsible to irresponsible conduct. This insight would not only protect the other members of the family from developing false notions of blame and expressing hostile and cruel responses toward their mentally unsound relative, but it would also provide therapeutic influences in place of the aggravating reaction.

The abnormal attitude itself may have, at least in part, a domestic origin. In any case it is true that when the psychiatrist assumes the task of re-educating such an individual in the hope of helping him to achieve sanity, it is necessary to regard the family, as a whole, as an integral part of the problem. The patient cannot be separated from his home environment.[11] Whenever any member of a family is beginning to show the symptoms of mental disorder in some noncharacteristic emotional attitude—and this is the most probable expression of the disorder—a tragic domestic situation arises at once, for which the average family is totally unprepared. It seems to other members of the

[11] William S. Sadler, *Theory and Practice of Psychiatry*, p. 40.

family that the son, daughter, father, or mother has become strangely peculiar, and yet his or her attitudes are taken seriously and reacted to as if they were a product of willful hostility or suspicion. If the symptoms have been developing over a long period of time every opportunity is provided for domestic disorganization.[12]

The morbid attitude may be so much a part of the domestic setting that it cannot be understood unless the causal, familial interactions are explored. It also may be so related to the home situation that it is difficult to give therapeutic efforts a fair chance unless there is a separation of the patient from his family. This may be true even when there are strong ties of affection. Indeed, such a relationship may be partly responsible for the irrational, emotional behavior. Hospital administrators bear testimony to the fact that frequently a patient's gain of weeks may be lost in an hour's visit from some member of the former home environment. As a consequence, some hospitals insist that the relatives stay away until the patient has fully recovered. Even then a problem arises when he goes back home and faces again the circumstances that at least are related to his mental illness when they are not in some measure the cause.

The welfare of the family itself also needs consideration, since it may suffer from attitudes taken on by its members in their reaction to the knowledge that one whom they love has been committed to an asylum. The suggestiveness of such an occurrence is a danger, especially to the older child. Attitudes that lead to suicide are frequent among the insane; and when they are carried to overt act, the family has thrown upon it powerful incentives toward morbid attitudes, ranging from profound shame to a growing fear on the part of some member of the family that he in turn will imitate the deed of the loved one. This emotional reaction rather than heredity often explains the repetition of suicide in a family group. Again, as one would

[12] Edwin E. McNiel, "The Psychiatric Patient's Family," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 95:923-943.

expect, children are more susceptible than adults. Any happening that brings the family into social disrepute may create morbidity in the emotional life of those most sensitive.

The development of emotional traits

Observation of the emotional responses of children reveals not only excessive but also incongruous reactions. The child behaves contrary to what one would expect, or even in reverse. The situation calls forth an emotional expression that seems unreasonable, it is so contrary to what one has come to think of as usual under such circumstances. This is one of the reasons why it is impossible to regard emotion as a reaction determined by a definite environmental condition. Indifference appears where there is every reason for serious concern. Grief fails to penetrate, when, looked at objectively, one would suppose that there would be expression of deep sorrow. On the other hand, some trivial occurrence produces strong feelings of guilt or paralyzing dismay. There are too many variations to permit us to formulate a determining relationship between any environmental situation and its specific emotion in the reacting child.

In order to find a clue to these incongruous reactions, attention must be given to the total personality. The emotional response is never passive, a mere mechanical response to environmental stimuli. Both the quantity and the quality of the emotions that any situation invokes are subjectively determined. The response may not be characteristic of the personality as it usually functions. Nevertheless it is a product of an inward interpretation and not a mere discharge controlled by outward influences.

As the personality takes form, emotional habits accumulate. These bring inclinations toward definite emotional attitudes that may persist over long periods without any apparent reason. By this process emotional traits become fixed, and the person becomes predisposed toward definite emotional behavior. Once these are well established, they find constant occasion for expres-

sion, even though there is no external situation to explain their coming. The environment may present no reason for fear and yet the child may be characteristically shy and timid, meeting neutral and even sympathetic situations as if they threatened his security.

These prominent attitudes, even when they act to prejudice outward occurrences, may not be obvious, at least in any superficial contact with the child. Frequently, when his self-consciousness is well developed, he may attempt to cover up his emotional idiosyncracies. It is as if he felt himself subject to criticism and sought self-protection through concealment and the forceful substitution of behavior not at all in accord with his deeper feeling. These habit-fixed attitudes may gather in time about a dominant emotional outlook, a tendency toward a qualitative type of emotional response, thus becoming the temperament of the person. It is a basic emotional mood that determines the attitudes by coloring the meaning of environmental experience. Once this disposition has become well formed, emotional flux comes to an end as the attitudes organize under the dominance of the characteristic temperament. It is conceived in childhood and is certainly the product of complex causation. Heredity, physiology, especially endocrine contributions, eventful experience, suggestion, contacts, and opportunities for self-expression have a part in its development. Since the members of the household are possessed each by his own temperament, the interaction is a commixture of moods in which the aggressive individual tends to set the prevailing domestic dominance, as is true of the commanding mood within each individual personality. However, every possible variation of emotional compound occurs.

Whatever the emotional composition that results from the intimate associations of the members, the home takes on its characteristic emotional coloring and comes to have a dominant trend that is very like the temperament of the individual. This family complex the child helps to create, since his presence normally invokes the emotions of the adults as well as of the

other children; and these reactions, as made by each individual, are highly colored by personal temperament. The child also has to react to the domestic emotional system as it is expressed by the prevailing mood of the household. It is one of the most substantial of his environmental influences, even though it can only be detected by what happens emotionally as the various members of the family associate together and interact to each other's presence. It also may beget in the child a dominant domestic expectation which in turn, when he marries and establishes a family, can become his chief emotional contribution. The mood of the home of his childhood is not, however, necessarily embedded in his own experience as a product of a passive acceptance, the mere taking on of the characteristic domestic temperament of his first domestic environment.

That pervasive but frequently subtle characteristic of the individual family which is best described as atmosphere has a large meaning in the effect it produces during the time when the child is forming his basic emotional attitudes. The spirit of the family, its domestic philosophy, permeates the emotional character of the child, and in some instances analysis easily discovers that this familial trait has been the most molding of all the influences that have flowed in upon the child.

The domestic significance of childhood attitudes

Since childhood is a formative period of characteristic emotional disposition, any effort to interpret emotional aspects of domestic adjustment must give attention to the preadult happenings. It is necessary, in this attempt to trace the lines of development of the established attitudes that appear in adult life, to recognize that childhood and adolescence make elemental and formative contributions to the entire emotional development and are interrelated with all the other important accumulations of emotional experience.

The psychoanalyst, in his need for understanding adult character, tries to retrace these developments in order to get an

understanding of their origin and their strength. This effort is difficult not only because it requires probing the past but also because it requires an artificial isolation of certain aspects of experience that in the period itself were embedded in the totality of emotional development. A perfect interpretation of the meaning of these childhood constructions would require a complete rehearsal of the emotional career of the individual. Even though this limitation and the risk such an attempt carries of exaggeration and distortion must be recognized, it is possible to select certain especially significant centers of interest in childhood and interpret them as the nucleus out of which grew later adult attitudes.

Sex is one of these, and every investigation of the formation, psychically and socially, of an individual personality gives emphasis to its importance as it takes shape in childhood attitudes. There is abundant evidence that the home, here as elsewhere, occupies a strategic position during the time that the emotional trend gets its start. As a consequence, the significance of the sex attitude, as it operates later in adult experience, is largely determined by parental attitudes and by the influence of the prevailing culture as it reveals its social attitude toward sex. If these parental and group reactions do not give suggestions that promote conflict between the later physical impulses and the standards that the family and society support, there is no special problem of cultural origin in adult marital adjustment. On the contrary, when sex is interpreted to the child so as to encourage shame, guilt, or any degree of morbid feeling, opportunity is created for later disturbance, ranging from trivial, easily overcome obstacles to wholesome marriage fellowship to such powerful recoil against anything sexual as to outweigh every other impulse and thereby either prevent marriage or destroy all hope of its success.

Although shock makes its contribution to the establishment of these adverse attitudes, parental inclination, often very subtle and even unconscious in its expression, is more important. There is abundant evidence that sex shock when not reinforced by adult

attitudes is less mischievous than is usually supposed.[13] The sensitiveness of the child conditions such occurrences, but even more so does the reaction the adult makes to the experience of the child. For example, the psychic suggestions of parents may be so powerful as to make an experience of assault or rape permanently and deeply injurious although the physical attack, dealt with differently, would yield much less serious consequences.[14]

Another contribution the home frequently makes to the growth of attitudes of the child that have a large place in their influence upon the later adult career is made up of the suggestions that are given regarding marriage. It has frequently been pointed out how heavily burdened the mating impulse may be on account of the attitude of the father, or more frequently the mother, toward matrimony. This is transmitted to the child continually through suggestions, often without a realization on the part of the parent, until the former has built in his developing personality an attitude toward marriage that turns him away from it or makes it hard for him to achieve good adjustment if he does marry. The attitude, once established, becomes a menace to the child's growing emotional life.

The child may also gather attitudes from his status in the family. Domestic interaction offers a wide range for the development in the child of troublesome emotional reactions. The only child may be displaced by the coming of a brother or sister. A girl may be spoiled by being the only one in a family of boys, or the reverse may occur. The parent may show preference or appear to show preference for one of his children. The mere place[15] of the child in age relation to his brothers or sisters may lead to the building of a strong emotional attitude that soon becomes a characteristic trait of the personality. Status must always, however, be interpreted as part of a total environmental situation. This means that the potential disposition of

[13] Lewis M. Terman, *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*, pp. 250-251.
[14] E. R. Groves, *Marriage*, pp. 211-212.
[15] Lawrence K. Frank, "Personality and Rank Order," *American Journal of Sociology*, 35:177-186.

the child, as well as the attitudes of the parents, has to be taken into account in getting at the significance of the placement of the child with reference to other children in the family.

The child's integrity and the domestic environment

The child must have recognition of his own self-interest in order to provide motive for his emotional preparedness for life. The domestic program of values cannot be forced upon him through external authority without sacrifice of his normal development. Domestic despotism strikes at the emotional integrity of the child just as political despotism does at the social emotions of the sensitive adult. The mere rightness or wholesomeness of the family policy is not sufficient. The test, so far as the child is concerned, can never be a purely objective questioning as to whether he is given a proper routine for his upbringing on account of the fact that, judged dispassionately, his emotions as they are developed and expressed color his personality and decide his reactions. The situation taken by itself may not seem sufficient to explain his behavior; indeed, it may often appear contrary to what we would expect to be true judging by its effects upon the child's personality.

It is necessary in order to provide a sound training program that the family interpret its values, its scheme of life, in such a way as to win the approval of the child and enlist his co-operation. His response has to be more than an intellectual consent, a recognition of adult logic, or even the realization of good will. Such methods of committing the child to the family program may be important, but in addition there has to be the winning of his emotional support. This means that he must find in the domestic situation in which he is embedded opportunities to express and to realize his own self-interest. If, on the contrary, the child is driven into the family regime and required by pressure to accept it as a mechanism that has control over his conduct, he is likely either to rebel emotionally or to experience inner conflict, for he will separate himself from those who

coerce him and in his inmost feelings become more and more an alien protecting himself from what he interprets as attacks upon his integrity.

The significance of this is still inadequately appreciated by many educators and parents who attempt to handle children and young people whose behavior borders on delinquency.

The delinquency of children coming from conventionally good homes can often be explained by the fact that in spite of the reputation the family has for maintaining the proper social standards, its atmosphere, as interpreted by the child, is at a great distance from wholesomeness. It is sometimes oppressively severe. It may even be hypocritical. Superficially well ordered, the home may hide underlying conflicts and antagonisms that are not less impressive to the child because they are for the most part concealed, especially from the adult responsible for invoking them. Here the sensitiveness of children is remarkable. If, as sometimes happens, they cannot take anyone into their confidence and confess their feeling, the injury from such a situation can be very great, as it establishes an unwholesome emotionalism that is later carried over into adult life.

Emotions help to make attitudes; they also bring about changes in attitudes. A crisis situation may arise for which no ready-made attitude is adequate, and painful though it may be to reconstruct such a strong habit-complex, it can be accomplished. These situations that force reconstruction can occur in the domestic life, as may be illustrated by a child's reaction to the death of a parent or to his divorce. The former well-established attitudes of the child may not fit at all as new emotional demands are made upon him, the result being that the fundamental attitudes themselves have to be reconstructed.

The pressure for change may come from out-of-the-family occurrences. History records even in our own time shifts of social feeling that are nothing less than cultural earthquakes as they shape the habit and the spirit of individual homes. Even within the privacy of the family the parent may not dare to maintain the social attitudes that he once held without danger.

He may find himself obliged to assume, for economic or social safety, attitudes absolutely contrary to those that he had previously attempted to instill into his children. Mass contagion, however, is so effective that recognitions of these changes in family policy and principles are less frequent than a happier interpretation of human nature would suggest. Pepys has most impressively described the ease with which a population may reverse itself and welcome Charles II with the same hearty applause that shortly before had been given Cromwell. Although the adult may take on and later shed without any feeling of inconsistency a social allegiance which generates its own appropriate attitude, this quick transformation may leave in the growing child lasting emotional confusion or conflict of integrity.

Social workers have frequently called attention to one change of attitude that the child finds extremely difficult, so confusing and obnoxious as occasionally to send him into some sort of delinquency as a means of relief. This is his awakening to the fact, or his assuming the fact, that he is not the child, as he had supposed, of his parents. The adopted child whose status has been concealed or the child who for some reason suspects that he is illegitimate may find it impossible to switch from the attitude toward his parents and toward life that he had gathered through his feeling of kinship. The adult may think it strange that this causes such strong reaction, especially when the parents' affection is well established, but the testimony the child gives is most convincing. Any disturbance of his previous notion of blood relationship becomes for him a catastrophe in relationship and one to which he finds adjustment difficult. In any case, reconstruction of attitude becomes a necessity.

Changing attitudes are also demanded of children in the family by other than spectacular events. The progressive character of good domestic adjustment itself insists that the child move forward emotionally, and this requires the giving up of old and the taking on of new attitudes. Although this process may leave the major current unchanged, there has to be considerable displacement, and this in turn means that the attitude of the child

must grow even when there is no serious reshaping. There may also be an emotional attitude toward change itself, due to family influence. For example, the individual who comes from a conventional routine-like family experience may find in marriage serious emotional conflict resulting from the necessity of new adaptations. The inability to adjust to changed conditions that occasionally forces businessmen, formerly successful, into bankruptcy has its duplicate in domestic failure.

The emotional exploitation of children

It may be difficult for the individual family to convince the child emotionally that his self-interest is being recognized. This may be because in actual fact the child is right in feeling that he is not being dealt with as a personality who has his own individual rights to maintain. Unfortunately it is also true that the child can be easily exploited by a program that only deceives him as it leads him to an emotional acquiescence. He is made to feel that those who control the conditions of his life do recognize his interests when, as a matter of fact, his welfare is perverted by emotional flaws in the parents or other members of the family. More is necessary for his growth than his favorable response, important as that is. The family program must be tested not only by its ability to appeal to the child but also by its effects upon his emotional growth. In the end its policy must be demonstrated by its influence upon the later adult career as this functions both emotionally and socially in the greater out-of-the-family environment.

The hazards that come forth from the emotional characteristics of the parent and the emotional conditions of a definite cultural setting have been clearly defined as they have appeared in the contemporary American home. They may be classified as five possible exploitations of the emotional needs of children:

1. *Using the child for the parent's satisfaction.* Instead of the parent serving the child, the parent may insist upon being served emotionally. The family motive then becomes not giving

the child an opening for his emotional self-expression but rather using him as the means by which the parent satisfies his own emotional needs. As a rule, such a parent has extravagant and unsound self-craving. Not being able to gain any considerable measure of self-fulfillment in the ordinary adult relationships, he turns to the child, who, on account of his lack of experience and his unformed character, is too helpless to provide any obstruction to the parent's designs.

Students of child welfare have repeatedly pointed out the special temptation that comes to parents who for any reason are emotionally lonely or have lost confidence in their ability to find emotional security elsewhere than in the affection of a child. It is an avaricious emotional hunger that grows with its success in utilizing the child, and one that can become so imperious in its influence as to overwhelm all other considerations and make life a major conquest of the child by the adult. Even if the child successfully resists or rebels as he moves toward emotional maturity, the contest, involving the repudiation of affection—because this is the means by which the parent endangers the integrity of the individual—hurts him and takes away the security that sound emotional development requires. He may become fearful of any ties that may subjugate him to someone else. As a consequence, the injury that the child receives from overindulgence, excessive protection, or any other form of emotional oppression, carries over into attitudes that forbid normal experience later unless re-education can be achieved.

2. *Ignoring or neglecting the child's emotional needs.* The child cannot be brought up in an emotional vacuum. In his early years, however, before he has any chance to find substitutes for his parents' deficiencies, he is at the mercy of the household routine. This may hurt him as seriously by withholding affection as by overwhelming him with love. Moreover, mischief may come from the child's misinterpretation and conviction that he is neglected when in fact the parents are either reticent in expressing their feelings or unnaturally curbing themselves on account of fear of overindulgence.

3. *Having the home inimical to the emotional requirements of the child.* Although this domestic fault is more likely to occur in later childhood, when the boy or girl is beginning to take on a considerable amount of personality and therefore becomes more aware of the desire for emotional self-determination than during the infancy and preschool period, it is possible from the beginning to frustrate the impulses of the child and stir up adverse emotional responses. This need not be a malicious program but merely a consequence of lack of experience with children and a failure to understand childhood cravings.

4. *Making the child a medium for parental ambition.* This is a particularly subtle type of exploitation, because it tends to be rationalized so that the parent makes himself believe that he is merely trying to do for the child what is for his best interests. The literature of child study abounds in extraordinary attempts on the part of parents to fulfill self-ambition or to recover from guilt or inferiority feelings by making use of the child. Parental ambition is one of the treacherous motives that lead parents to seek their own self-fulfillment at the expense of their offspring, while another family hazard comes from the eagerness of some parents to push their children forward toward adult maturity with no regard for the need of a gradual deepening and expanding of the emotional life. This also may result from parental vanity. The child is forced into a false reaction to life, and frequently the demands put upon him make a schism in his personality so that he becomes double-faced, able to act in accord with parental expectations when he is on parade or under scrutiny while at other times, when the domestic authority is relaxed, he expresses emotions that are not only backward in their childishness but absolutely contrary to his former ostentatious behavior. It is difficult under such circumstances for the growing child to maintain his emotional integrity, for the constant pressure on him is toward a fictitious show of maturity.

5. *Making the child feel emotional insecurity.* There may be no stability in the environment the child's parents provide. He may be overcultivated at one moment and thrown aside

at another. His emotions may at one time be stimulated by household policy and at another, under similar circumstances, thwarted and criticized. The inconsistencies and the extremes of this emotional anarchy, hysterical in its unpredictableness, teach the child to conceal his emotions or to find, if he is old enough to switch his environment, an outlet elsewhere. If the child can find some substitute, some solid contact with a person who understands children and furnishes them stability, he is fortunate.

These various attacks that unsound family life makes upon children and their personality development may profoundly affect the growing emotional character of the victims, but not in such a way as to permit any certain prediction as to what will be the consequence. The original disposition of the child, his basic constitution, enters largely into such experience, so that one child may emerge from an unwholesome setting with different life-attitudes than does even his brother or his sister. The difficulties of the emotional development are, however, always increased during childhood, and its ever-present hazards are intensified. Often the injury comes so early in the child's life that its result seems to be a characteristic trait of the personality, and the reaction he gets from others establishes all the more firmly his unfortunate habitual attitude.

The discouraging element in all forms of parental exploitation is the blindness of the adults as to what their coercion is doing to the child. They are not only oblivious but also egoistically so well protected that it is rarely they can gain insight. Intellectually, they can be made to see the dangers of such faulty domestic programs in the abstract. Concretely and emotionally, criticism rarely penetrates. It is possible for them even to detect similar mistakes on the part of other parents while not realizing that they are doing the very thing that they condemn. Parenthood education, in order to have any effectiveness, must either prevent the parent's assuming the various types of emotional tyranny over the child or accomplish the still more difficult task of helping the parent to reconstruct his attitudes.

It is evident that the success of parenthood education as a preventive of trouble depends upon a preparedness which can be best given before motherhood or fatherhood is experienced. American cultural conditions demand that this foundation work be accomplished not only in the high-school period but even as much as possible in the grades. Before parental emotions get any chance to take pattern, there is need of establishing an openness of mind which will later permit the self-scrutiny that protects from emotional excesses. Needless to say, such instruction has no chance to function in later life unless it establishes in the pupil emotional attitudes that in some measure objectify parent-child relationships.

The danger to the child is always something more than the direct consequences of the exploitation by the parent. There is the graver possibility always of an emotional conflict as the child finds himself driven in two directions. His craving for an adequate outlet for his own impulses and his desire to build up affectionate relationships with his parents collide. Light intermittent clashes awaken self-consciousness and stimulate growth, but a division between two equally strong desires that allow no compromise provides a fertile field for the development of any type of morbidity, depending, as it takes shape, upon the influences of the total situation, including the hereditary predisposition as well as the entire social environment, past and present. The foundation is easily laid for later anxieties, phobias, and compulsive behavior.[16]

Pubic upheaval

It is possible to exaggerate the problems of adolescence and to charge up to a period of physiological change difficulties that are a product of an earlier domestic situation. In the family where the emotional development of the child is fostered and directed the approach to puberty is gradual; the individual slides

[16] Harrington, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

into adolescence not as a captive suddenly pushed out of his cage, but as a child who has been led increasingly to accept self-direction and responsibility. At best there is enough storm and stress connected with the experience, but its unrest and instability are frequently greatly magnified by a family policy that has suppressed, denied, or perverted the child's emotional cravings so that often he does not have adequate preparedness to meet the changing circumstances but is desperate and restless to break away from ties that have been binding for a long time but that now are unendurable. His breaking forth in new emotional demands, his rebellion or repudiation of his one-time allegiance, or his indifference to familial coercion may be an announcement that for a second time and under less favorable conditions he is offering his home the opportunity to unite his desire for self-integrity and a fellowship of affection with his parent.

It is true that no period of life requires so much remaking of the emotional life as does adolescence, and that because of this there is a great incidence of mental disorder.[17] There are basic biological changes, especially of endocrine character, as well as an entrance into a social life that is charged with emotional intensity. Nevertheless, adolescence may be a more significant culmination than beginning. The child's life preceding it may have been one of such emotional insecurity, confusion, and struggle that puberty opens the floodgates of a long pent-up feeling with behavior-consequences that are charged to the passage from childhood to adult life rather than, as should be true, to the exploiting program that has done such violence to the normal impulses of the child. In a simple culture where growing up is taken as a matter of course, where the domestic program is relatively casual and any disturbance within the household is given quick, direct expression, adolescence does not become a critical testing of either parent or child.[18] Adolescence cannot escape its cultural liabilities, but to a great extent

[17] A. P. Noyes, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry*, p. 62.
[18] Margaret Mead, *Coming of Age in Samoa*, pp. 198-199.

it is the family policy that decides whether these are to be grievous or light.

Emotional change within the family

The family must provide for emotional changes in the individuals that compose it. Emotional experience is too deeply rooted in physiological conditions ever to settle itself in a changeless form. This will always provide a great part of the drama of family life. Like any other organization, the home has a tendency to develop a routine, to settle down, but this inclination is forever being broken into by the fact that the various members of the family constantly change emotionally. This, of course, is especially true of the child, who from infancy on to the end of adolescence passes through emotional stages that are extremely upsetting to domestic consonance. It is not true, however, that the child alone brings household mutations. The husband-wife relationship also normally carries emotional changes even when this cannot be interpreted as marital progress.

The demands that these changing emotional traits of the different individuals of the family make upon the others in interaction lead to every conceivable formation of home patterns. One hardly takes shape, however, before it is subject to attack, because the shifting emotions forbid permanent equilibrium and stability. The tendency toward habit-formation works toward settlement. Emotional fluctuation, partly seasonable and partly the idiosyncrasy of the individual, works in the opposite direction. The result is that the family life provides conflict as the emotions drive toward a finality, some sort of comfortable adjustment and security, and at the same time make and encounter new demands that antagonize or destroy routine.

In this emotional disturbance the individual family shows its uniqueness. Some families come remarkably close to a fixed emotional scheme while others are in continuous flux and

scarcely achieve momentary settlements, the emotional careers of its members are so inconstant and the need of radical realignment so frequent. Cultural setting plays a part in this domestic quest for emotional adjustment, but if there is any opening for individual self-expression, the family program is even more a product of the temperament and attitude of the various members as these react to inward and environmental changes.

Then there are the extraordinary, tragic happenings that bring to families a quick and searching demand for a reconstruction of emotional behavior. These also are received with every possible variation. The family may even go so far as to anchor itself in the one-time pleasanter routine and try to carry on as if a great catastrophe had not come and reshaped the family association. The more solid in its affection the family unit has become, the more desperate those members left after some disaster may find themselves. The final meaning of such experiences, however, must be found in the previous emotional career, temperament, and attitude as the attempt to achieve a new emotional adjustment to a mutilated home discloses the resources of each individual for the fateful passage from the old to the new domestic order.

XV. *The Family and the Aggressive Mechanisms*

THE FAMILY INVITATION. The various aspects of the family, including marriage, provide unexcelled opportunity for both the origin and the expression of personality maladjustments. The family setting, because of its high emotional content, invites the growth and the display of the basic psychic weaknesses of human nature. This is inherent in the domestic situation. As a consequence, from Plato's *Republic* to the thinking of our own time the orthodox parent-child relationship has been attacked as a menace to social progress and individual mental health by critics of the family, who insist upon the need of establishing some less emotional substitute for the self-enclosed, private home. The problem, however, lies deeper than even the composition of the family as a social institution. It is rooted in the peculiar dependency of the human infant and the adult responses his helplessness invokes, carrying the relationship beyond that of animal instincts into the complexities of self-conscious reactions. This fact cannot be made a defense of family unsoundness, but it does reveal that the temptations of parents and children are the result of the personal, intimate, meaningful association that alone fulfills human need. The hazards of the fellowship, the possibility of emotional dominance and retardation, are evidences of the depth of the incentives that impel human nature, refined and made sensitive by social evolution, toward the parent-child attachments.

In spite of this inherent familial liability, the risk the home offers is in no small measure influenced by its cultural setting. The content of family experience may be reduced to meagerness,

and the group may also restrict the development of parent-child relationships so as to provide something between the instinct-limited alliance of the animal and her offspring, and the conditions provided by an American home made up of members richly individualized and deeply sensitive. The anthropologists in recent years have brought us many pictures of such culturally circumscribed, familial experience. The barriers that are erected against the emotional extension of parent-child relationship which in our time invites the egoistic weaknesses of human nature are also accompanied by a lesser development in the meaning of the experience itself.

In any case, the safeguarding of modern family life cannot come from processes of reduction in the effort to move back to the cultural conditions of a less complex society, but in understanding that, needful as is the modern type of family heavily laden with emotion, it provides an opportunity for the coming out of maladjustments to life and, because of its intimate contacts, may evoke weaknesses in those who are emotionally insufficient for the tasks that modern civilization has forced upon them.

The psychic maladjustments that loom so large in family life are mechanisms potentially inherent in the refinement of self-consciousness. They become abnormalities when they reach such a magnitude and intensity that they dominate and defeat effective adjustment to the subjective situation or the environmental circumstances or both. Self-consciousness perverts itself, using its resources to escape the demands of adaptation to life.

The family career has a large part in encouraging and directing these perversions of conduct. The family also provides for most people the freest expression for these aberrations of mental integrity. To charge the family, however, with the responsibility for these, as an original causation, is as arbitrary and misleading as to attempt to sever the personality for diagnostic purposes into distinct, self-contained body and mind components. Just as the individual is a total personality that we can separate into mind and body, as each functions, only by arbi-

trary, verbal dissection, so the family cannot be dislodged from the full cultural situation and made to take over an exclusive responsibility for the nurturing of the unadapting mechanisms. Not only is the prevailing culture a part of the total situation which takes the individual off the pathway that leads to straightforward, mature adjustment, but so also are the particular social conditions which he faces or thinks he faces. The influences that operate are composite even in cases in which there is such an overwhelming evidence of one particular line of causation—as, for example, physical disease within the body—that one is tempted to forget all the other contributions to the maladjustment.

Human nature cannot escape the liabilities of the highly developed civilization which intelligence has produced. The control or at least the utilization of natural resources and the artificial reconstruction of environment have necessarily had corresponding artificial effects upon self-consciousness, sharpening the egocentric awareness. This means that each individual, taken as a total functioning personality, has his power to adjust to life tested. His ordeal is as unique as is his personality itself. His original constitution as well as his experience determines his destiny. As one would expect, knowing the formative character of childhood and the influences of family association, the home has a large part in the development of the traits that decide the quality of his adjustment to life.

It is not, however, the home as an objective, social entity that according to theoretic, abstract standards brings forth the influences toward or away from wholesome adaptation. It is the home as an operating institution acting upon the one unique person that discloses its significance. This is an irritating complication both in the analysis of the conduct of the person and in the interpretation of the family. It individualizes not only the home as a particular social organization but also its creative processes as they enter the lives of each individual member.

The family an incubator for emotion

When we scrutinize closely the characteristics of the modern family, it is evident that it has the conditions for the bringing forth of the psychic mechanisms that defeat sound adjustment. The family provides an intimacy that is more complete and normally more continuous that that provided in any other association. It is not only a day-by-day contact but one in which the inhibitions that hold back emotional self-expression are apt to be lower than anywhere else. Although there are striking exceptions to this generalization, it falls short as a description of the freedom the emotions enjoy within the home. It is within the domestic contacts that the emotions come nearest to being undressed and to showing themselves in their genuine nakedness.

Characteristically also, family life is made up of enforced contacts. Here again there are striking exceptions. There are individuals who go in and out of family experience just as they enter or leave the house. There are also individuals who can release themselves from family association and take emotional excursions, dissolving for the moment their familial linkage with others. On the other hand, the analysis of human contacts shows that family intimacy is ordinarily profound and compelling. It disregards distance and even ignores death. Ties may be resented, but they are not on that account less strong. Usually the family enforces physical contacts. This may mean the living together of persons who, were they not of blood relationship, would choose to be strangers.

Privacy is another household trait that gives abounding opportunity for emotional expression. That this is eagerly grasped by egocentric persons is an additional indication of the inherent liabilities of domestic interaction. Some people there are who generate within the family frustration which is relieved elsewhere in such reactions as vocational or social tyranny or self-relieving agitation. The tide that sweeps in is, however, as a rule greater in its meaning than this outward flow of emotion.

The strain of outside suppressions, inferiorities, conflicts, and feelings of failure is released, according to a well-established habit, within the household, becoming in turn an originating contagion as the victim acts upon the other members of the association. His discharge of emotions may, in fact, lead to such responses and attitudes that the household setting becomes a secondary source of frustrations. Thus, failure to adapt to the conditions outside the home so fashions the household environment that the individual recoils emotionally from it as he previously has from life itself.

This is only one of the various ways in which the privacy of the home may be employed for emotional release. A contrary situation arises when he who feels unequal to the demands out of the home seeks and receives, within its privacy, compensation and security. Freedom of self-expression is used for getting rid of the tension. Whatever effect this may have upon the total personality of one who must cope with life on a wide area, the domestic relationships taken by themselves furnish an environment in which the individual feels secure. It is here that we find the therapeutic value of the family for those who must have, in order to maintain self-respect and balance, a sphere of life in which they do not feel inferiority. The home in such circumstances frequently becomes an emotional asylum in which someone functions as a nurse to wounded feelings. At times this goes so far as to create a sort of dualistic career, the outer ineffectual adaptations gaining at least a measure of self-respect because there gathers about them a degree of courage and self-tolerance born of the domestic fellowship.

Owing to the division of labor in the orthodox family, the man is more likely to profit from this recharging of pride and confidence than the woman. So far as this use of family privacy is concerned, it is profoundly true that the woman suffers, in a way that adds to her nervous liabilities, from not having a wife.[1] Even this generalization, however, is not safe

[1] The woman attempting a career will appreciate Sarah Orne Jewett's reply to Whittier, that she had more need of a wife than of a husband.—Francis Otto Matthiessen, *Sarah Orne Jewett*, p. 72.

because the roles may be reversed and the woman may find in her husband the emotional succor that her feelings of stress and frustration demand. The family as an institution cannot protect itself against an emotional misuse of its resources without losing one of its characteristic traits.

The nonprivate family is a mere shell of an organization, not so much because the home needs concealment as that it has to have emotional distinction. Even the Oneida Community, which wisely feared individualism and any special emotional ties between the sexes, realized the need of giving to the individual a measure of privacy. This demand was accepted architecturally and its satisfaction must have had an important part in continuing the life of the community. Even so, it appears clear that the psychological commitments, the essential basis of privacy, persisted stubbornly in spite of the crusade that Noyes made against what he regarded as one of the greatest of sins. He had strategic insight, for it was in such home-seeking incentives that the organization faced its greatest inward danger. It is interesting to notice that it was not merely those of the first generation who had been accustomed to household privacy who felt the pressure, but even, and perhaps most of all, the children who were from the beginning accustomed to a meagerness of emotional intimacy and privacy.[2]

The basic, underlying stratum upon which all the other peculiar traits of the family rest is affection as a motivation. Intimacy is possible, emotional intensity is certain, undissolvable relationship expected, and privacy demanded because the family functions in the medium of the most imperious of human emotions, affection. This may take, so far as the individual family is concerned, either a negative or a positive form; but in either case the consequences, as recorded in the personalities and their reactions to one another, are unrivaled. Indeed, the individual home can hardly function at all if the members are not bound together by love or its reverse, hate. Psychiatric literature

2 Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House*, pp. 165-166.

brings testimony to the fact that the home, rightly interpreted, demonstrates that its underlying support, as its members react to one another, is in a feeling which ranges from intense hate to an almost complete fulfillment of finite hunger for affection. One is the negative, the other the positive aspect of love.

It is this trait of the family more than any other that invites the expression of psychic maladjustments. The family could function more easily if it could lighten the load that human demand places upon it; but more and more in the modern world the vitality of the family comes from the fact that so much is sought from it. On this account, events in family life have more meaning than those that occur outside. This statement is, however, not true unless it be remembered that the adolescent, for example, may be loosened from the family of his childhood and emotionally tied to the home of his dreams which, although it is something anticipated rather than experienced, is nevertheless, so far as its emotional significance is concerned, more influential than his objective realities. Dislodged from the family in which fate placed him, he lives in the romantic expectations toward which his face is turned.

The family and subjective maladjustments

The awakening of self-consciousness brings with it the desire for attention. Although this is an unescapable accompaniment of the awareness of the self, its strength and direction are subject to social influences. The strongest of these are generally in the hands of the family because of its emotional penetration. The parent-child relationship furnishes the means by which the awakening of self occurs; it also establishes the environment in which egocentric traits are most likely to be encouraged. The parent normally responds with interest to this increasing development of consciousness of self. The child in turn realizes this response increasingly as his sense of self develops. Such

a situation, indispensable as it appears to be for the growth of self-life, provides the most tempting field for the subjective excesses that can turn the intellect away from its proper use as a means of adjustment.

Attention-getting activities even precede the coming of self-consciousness. The baby that finds that he can capture his parents' interest by crying will seek this pleasure-giving response. The unknowing or the undisciplined parent by his ministrations may establish a habit-making responsiveness that leads the infant to become a household tyrant. As soon as a degree of self-consciousness appears, the child discovers a multitude of ways by which he can force the attention of the parent: asking questions, making faces, claiming to be ill, dawdling at the table, refusing food, and even incurring the anger of the parents. In an amazingly short incubation-period the child's chief motivation may become a constant effort to possess the concentration of the parent. The various ways he may do this illustrate not only how easily parenthood may be made the servant of egocentrism but also the power that such subjective incentives have of turning aside the intellect from its purpose as an instrument of adaptation. The child ceases to use curiosity as a means of intellectual growth but instead employs it to draw his parents to himself. The meal, instead of being a means of satisfying physical appetite, is made a psychic opportunity for self-exhibition. The child will even go so far as to curb his physical hunger in order that he may have the greater satisfaction of parental concern. Thus it is with each of the activities that he makes use of for the expression of his egocentrism. The intellect is forced to operate the various schemes of self-emphasis instead of dealing with the substantial demands of the objective environment.

This exaggeration of the self, which comes so easily in early childhood, is in itself detrimental to the growth of the personality. But there is an even greater menace that it brings. It turns the person from the objective environment and bids him revel in a subjective world that can be self-manipulated and

freed from factual adjustment. The child learns through his misuse of the parent-child relationship to seek the fulfillment of his vanities by holding to subjective values and making use of other people as servants of his self-contained emotions. Once this disposition is firmly established and the mind is turned back upon itself, using the environment as a source of egocentric stimuli, it is difficult to persuade the child to accept the harder task of meeting his emotional demands through a proper use of his psychic resources as a means of environmental adjustment.

The power of the family is so tremendous that it is not strange that we have much psychiatric pessimism regarding the social contributions of the home. Dangerous as parents necessarily are, we need to recognize that this egocentric excessiveness is an essential liability of self-consciousness rather than something that is brought into existence by the parent-child contact. The fact is that egocentric hazards are ever present, an accompaniment of self-conscious living, and are only more apparent in childhood because they take a form that is easily recognized. If childhood, or perhaps better infancy, provides allurements that lead away from psychic soundness, it is also true that it is in this same period that human nature wins its first victories. The family can be protective during the shaping of personality as well as dangerous.

The family and emotional maladjustments

The family is pre-eminently a value-giving institution. Its experiences are charged with potential significance. This is not true of all families. It is also not true that every individual member of the family gathers status-values from it. Instead there are individual men and women who easily shed themselves of all feeling of family relationship, maintaining a freedom that is either self-centered or socially minded, but destitute of domesticity past or present; but for the great majority of men and women and for even a greater proportion of children, the

family furnishes a stable relationship, a sense of linkage that persists in spite of change, distance, and the passing of time. By thus establishing a permanent frame of reference, a common bond of relationship, the family serves the need of human nature for emotional security. This quest for something that abides emotionally is catered to by all the major social institutions. Here is one of the services of the state and of the church. The latter especially provides for many persons a greater emotional security than they find through family experience. Even in such cases, however, the family chiefly functions at the first awakening of the desire, matures it, and leads it onward to a greater expectation.

The family not only becomes the nursery for those who learn to know their need of emotional security, but also provides for most men and women their chief emotional support in their kaleidoscopic associations. By birth we are thrust into a family setting in which the emotions struggle for a perpetuity of relationship. Thus the family has placed upon it by its biological and social functions an emotional ministration that the individual member with infrequent exception is eager to accept. The common relationship that binds the individual members together becomes a point of reference. The self is not content merely to gain its necessities and satisfactions through its interactions; it also seeks to find values that exist emotionally and only through the attitudes of others. Thus the self maneuvers in the attempt to feel that it is included in the common fellowship. It also estimates its position in relation to the others and their placement with reference to the self. It is this that gives emotional substance to what on the surface is transitory and mercurial. The occurrences are as separate episodes for the most part trivial, largely due to the ongoings of a more or less rigid routine.

This ongoing of experience, however, leaves a deposit—its emotional significance—and this is taken over by the memory and utilized by the imagination. The values that are refined from it reflect the hunger of the individual for emotional

security. In addition to this mass of day-by-day ordinary happenings, there are the occasional great moments. These are more likely to uncover the more lowly and quiet accumulation of values each individual has gathered than to bring an instantaneous allotment of values. It is the ever mounting evidences that the individual finds of his position as to others and their placement with reference to himself that constitute the appraisal of relationship that has the determining influence over the process of adjustment.

As self-consciousness comes to the child, it finds him predisposed frequently to make his reckoning and to react strongly to the position in which others, he feels, have placed him. His observations are, unlike those of the mariner charting his course, clouded with emotion; but their purpose, if given analysis, is the same. He takes his own place, unless there is an unusual and an unnatural obstruction, at the center. His scrutiny attemps to find out whether this is being recognized by others, and their nearness to, or distance from, him. Although his appraisements are subject to change, they harden quickly. The individual's second coming into a family when he marries reverses his first situation, since he enters laden with the values or the losses of a previous experience, so that as he reassigns himself and others he is emotionally dominated by the significance of his own childhood.

This emotional transference from former family interactions easily places upon the newly married man or woman the impossible task of attemping double adjustment to environmental situations. As effort is made to meet the demands of the moment, emotion is carried over from what may have been a dominant self-appraisal; and whether there is desire to repeat or to overcome this significance of the past, there is a turning aside in greater or less degree from the realities to which adjustment needs to be made. The self is so entangled in its first reaction to the emotional attempt to assess others for the gathering of self-values, that there cannot be the singleness of purpose that social adaptation requires.

This taking over of former experience explains the opportunity the family provides for the psychic mechanisms that disturb adjustment. Subjective emotionalism, a product of former interactions, may force attention away from the realities and make the immediate demand of the environment merely an occasion for rehearsing the past or of struggling against the hurt it inflicted. Even though the subjective element be praiseworthy and wholesome, its strength must be feared, since it can meddle with the processes of adjustment as certainly as can the undesirable products of past experience. A physician, for example, is wisely protected by convention from doctoring those to whom he is bound by love, or from operating upon them. His emotion may easily cloud his judgment or hamper his skill by the very eagerness it gives him to serve the patient. Family relationship affixes value to interaction. This may mean that in any concrete activity there cannot be the neutrality of intelligence that adequate adjustment demands.

This fact explains the clearness with which the psychic mechanisms that defeat the intellectual processes show up in family experience. These are defined differently by the various psychiatric schools, depending upon what motivation is assumed to be primary in social relationships; but when looked at from the viewpoint of their meaning in familial interaction, they group themselves in defensive and aggressive reactions to an attack, real or fictitious, that the self charges up to the attitudes of other people. Their meaning to the self is subjective, and therefore a product of previous family experience, or of what has come from an institution like an orphanage which has attempted to substitute for the family. One individual will retreat from a forbidding social environment, while another under similar conditions will attack whoever is held responsible for the injury to the self with a most intense emotional onslaught, depending upon the emotional slant that he began to acquire during early childhood.

In the infant's earliest reactions there appear the two fundamental tendencies best described by McDougall's concepts—

self-assertion and self-negation. The first carries the self forward and gives it spread and a sense of well-being; the second checks it, causes it to retreat from the environment, and brings a feeling of futility. The first is necessarily in ascendency during the early period of childhood, roughly up to at least two years, when the organism is making rapid growth, when it is being given food, drink, warmth, opportunity for sleep, physical comfort, and protection from disturbing and pain-giving conditions. Then comes a increasing interference and restriction from the world of adults. Pressure from the social environment is registering in a way that brings into consciousness elemental self-assertion and self-negation. The child is not merely being introduced to the new experience of recognizing that there are others besides himself and that they are not passively acquiescent to the demands that he puts upon them; he is being rapidly determined as a social personality by the effects of this alteration in the character of his contacts on his inherited predisposition. In his aggression he may go too far and, suffering defeats, react with jealousy or dominance. He may fail to recoil from his environmental attacks and develop defensive mechanisms. These will be discussed in the next chapter.

Jealousy as emotion

Jealousy is a frequent egoistic reaction to a sense of oppression. The attack against which the person reacts comes in the form of deprivation. Jealousy requires a social situation in which the victimized person feels, in comparing himself with others, that he is being dispossessed of what was rightly his or is being denied what rightly belongs to him. Like inferiority feeling, it carries a sense of lowered prestige; but unlike that reaction it refuses to accept the emotional subordination but instead drives the person to resentment. Inferiority feeling turns inward, leading the individual to struggle with a self-feeling which he discharges by compensation. Jealousy turns the attention outward, and the emotion flows belligerently toward those held responsible for the miscarriage of justice.

Jealousy shows itself so frequently in family experience that it is commonly looked upon as a characteristic trait. Since jealousy is an emotional rebellion against a disturbance of relationship or a threat against security, it necessarily represents one of the commonest hazards of family interactions. Frequently the home is its place of origin. Likewise it is within the family that jealousy commonly finds its freest expression.

In order to understand the meaning of jealousy as an emotional mechanism, it is necessary to distinguish between the feeling as an occurrence and as a habit. It is inconceivable that a normal child during his early formative period should escape all occasions that call forth the reaction of jealousy. Ordinarily these come and go as do his expressions of anger. When, however, the disposition toward jealousy has been created, we have a reaction of a different order. There is then a chronic readiness to find evidences of unfair treatment by others and a readiness toward strong protest. There is also the tendency to transfer the emotion from one candidate to another so that there is an almost continuous nursing of the sense of being ill treated. With chronic jealousy also goes predisposition to suspicion. This element of persistency marks the jealous person apart from the socially well adjusted, and reveals that there is an underlying source of motivation closely akin to feelings of inferiority.

Naturally the jealous person aggravates his condition. Even though he is quick to imagine injustices that do not exist, he is likely to stir up in those with whom he has association responses that give substance to his belief that they are discriminating against him. As a consequence, jealousy feeds upon itself, not uncommonly becoming the dominant trait of the personality. Jealousy may become overt and frequently appears in aggressions that may for the moment conceal what underlies. Anger, hate, and malicious gossip are three commonly chosen vehicles for the expression of chronic jealousy. It is evident that in such cases the real meaning of what appears on the surface can be discovered only by tracing back the connection

to its source. This relationship may be much less obvious than that of inferiority feeling and overcompensation. This fact has significance in the interpretation of chronic jealousy as it appears within the family.

Jealousy a liability of socialization

Self-conscious contact brings into play a comparison of the self with others. This is one of the accompaniments of interaction. The subjective meaning, however, that the individual finds in any aspect of his placement in relation to others invites emotional reaction. It is difficult to keep such measurements neutral and intelligent rather than partisan and emotional. As a consequence, jealousy easily enters such experiences. The feeling is so disturbing to group interaction and security that one of the purposes of socialization is to curb the expression of individual jealousy. The policy of the group may be just the opposite, however, when the comparison is between itself and some other group. In the modern state, for example, propaganda often skillfully fans impulses of jealousy toward other peoples, and this is regarded as a form of patriotism. Likewise, a household may have a policy of frowning upon jealousy between its members while at the same time they all all unite in what, accurately described, is jealousy of some other family.

This inclination to regard the position of others with reference to one's self is a necessary by-product of social contacts. This appears clearly when one searches out emotionally isolated personalities in simon-pure form found only among those suffering seriously from certain forms of mental disease as, for example, those who are in a stage of grandeur in paranoia. Such persons have surrendered concern for others. Wrapped in superiority, they escape any propensity toward jealousy feeling, but at the cost of loss of contact with their fellows. Normally, association invokes comparison of self with others. As attention is directed to the position of others in relation to

one's self, it is difficult when any inferiority is recognized not to feel emotional discomfort. This is the more true because the comparison that has meaning is between one's self and others with whom one feels tied. People who are distant and alien ordinarily are regarded with indifference. It is those who are near and related who are brought into measurement with the self. In case any inferiority is felt, emotion is added to the intellectual recognition of personal status.

Although jealousy is born of a situation, the dominating cause is the disposition of the person who is possessed by the feeling. The more ambitious and the more sensitive the individual, the greater his risk of showing jealousy. However, this personal propensity cannot be cut off from the total condition, for the form and the strength of the stimulating influences vary from place to place and from time to time.

Since the child's society is chiefly the family, it is inevitable that the significant, early occurrences of jealousy are largely within the home. Any caretaking personnel would, however, encounter a similar risk through the maintenance of a protective environment. This does not save individual homes from criticism, but it does forbid an indictment of the institution of the family as the fundamental cause of the jealousy of children. Since the growing life cannot be maintained in an emotional void, the comparison of self with others is an inevitable accompaniment of progressive interaction in the early period of childhood. Jealousy is an emotional coloring, an excess of meaning in self *vs.* other valuations. This does not establish jealousy as a necessary feature of personality, but it does reveal that the source from which jealousy flows is unavoidable in the association of immature persons.

The child's jealousy due to replacement

The spacing of children that has become common and possible in recent years has encouraged family situations that awaken jealousy in young children. A child is born into the

home and enjoys the monopoly of interest of his parents and near relatives. His freedom from competition extends beyond infancy long enough to become a basic assumption of his self-consciousness; then another child comes, and he is shocked when he finds that he no longer can count on the concentration of affection to which he had become accustomed. Indeed, he is forced to a sterner ordeal than merely learning to share parental concern and love with a rival. To him it seems that he has also been displaced from his high position and given instead an inferior status. His interpretation, moreover, in more than a few instances squares with the facts. This is the more likely to happen when the parents have preferred for their first child one of opposite sex, and the second child has fulfilled their desire. The quickness of the transformation, the rarity of any preparation for the event, the time when it comes, in the formative period of the dethroned child, all work together to produce sharp hurt and eventually chronic jealousy. Although such transference of parental affection can appear at any time in a series of childbirths, it is most apt to happen in the case of the first child.

The undiscerning parent does not notice the cruel reconstructions that the displaced child must make, and quickly. As a consequence, the parent may react harshly against any expression of hostility in the boy or girl that has been pushed aside, and by this treatment, which is additional evidence of what to the dislodged child seems a repudiation of relationship, drive in still more deeply the feelings of resentment, jealousy, and finally hate.

It is necessary to notice how subjective such emotional experiences may be. One child can go through such necessary reconstruction with slight difficulty, while another will lay down the foundation for lifelong protest. The total personality and the entire social situation decide the seriousness of such experiences in the developing life of children. Where preparation has been made for the event and there has been from the beginning in the program of the parents an attempt to protect from the excesses of the only-child status, the dan-

gers of jealousy are lessened, even eliminated. Where the competition is between opposite sexes, provided there is no tendency to discriminate by either parent, and when the ages of the two are such as not to bring sharp competition, jealousy is less likely to occur. In the first place, there is apt to be a recognition of difference between the two in their social careers, especially after they have passed into the period of self-consciousness, and therefore less likelihood of jealousy. In a similar way, children far enough separated by age differences do not feel the keenness of competition that so easily occurs to children nearer together. The increased liability of creating jealousy in children by displacement is not merely the consequence of the lessening birth rate and smaller families with children spaced, in accord with economic and maternal health purposes, three or four years apart. The increase of leisure, in the sense that there is less time devoted to productive effort, also permits the exaggeration of attention which creates in a child expectations that are dislodged when another child is born and becomes the center of interest.

Common incitements to childish jealousy

The replacement of a child by the birth of a brother or sister is not the only frequent cause of jealousy during childhood. Favoritism, or what seems to be favoritism, on the part of the parent is another common cause of jealousy. One of the best illustrations of this is the story of Joseph and his brethren.

> Now Israel loved Joseph more than all his children, because he was the son of his old age: and he made him a coat of many colors. And his brethren saw that their father loved him more than all his brethren; and they hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him.[3]

There need not be actual favoritism in order to create feel-

[3] Genesis 37:3, 4.

ings of jealousy. Any situation that is interpreted as partiality is sufficient to arouse the emotion. This fact frequently places a great burden upon parents who are obliged to recognize differences between children. Such a situation arises, for example, when one child is delicate, has some unescapable handicap, or for some reason needs to be very carefully handled. Some brother or sister looking on can easily misconstrue what is happening and become the victim of jealous imagination. On the other hand, when the sympathy of the more fortunate child is enlisted, the situation is reversed, and he may become such a partisan as to resent any apparent indifference or lack of consideration by the mother or the father.

Preferential treatment, or what is so regarded, of one sex in comparison with another becomes a fecund source of jealousy. The girl who experiences limitations or coercions in comparison with her brother easily falls victim to jealousy, and in some cases carries it over into her marriage, discharging it, whenever occasion permits, against her husband.

Jealousy in children may grow out of rivalry. The impulse to compete with others appears in childhood interactions just as it does in those of adults. Not only is it inconceivable that self-conscious contact could take place without provoking the desire to pit one's self against others, but without such propensity there would be loss of momentum for development. Imitation is a close neighbor to competition, and both operate in the life of the growing child to push his personality toward maturity. Indispensable as rivalry becomes as a part of the growing-up process, it lays the child's life open to the attack of jealousy. Unless the disposition has already been established, rivalry turns to jealousy usually because of a third element that enters into the interaction. Two children at play are not so likely to use jealous expressions when they have no audience or no interference from a third party. When, however, the child loses face, or thinks he does, in the estimation of someone looking on or interested in making comparison, discomfiture registers in the emotions and easily turns to jealousy.

Parents all too often inject themselves into the rivalry of children, giving both the inferior and the superior child an exaggerated sense of value. The parent may be irritated or even made to feel shame at the poor exhibition of his child, and in some way uncovering his feelings, he brings the humiliation that becomes the forerunner of jealousy. As a rule, the parent encourages jealousy by obtuseness and carelessness. His criticisms arise from only trivial attention to the situation of the child, but the latter's attitude predisposes him to take too seriously what is said or even the meaning of a gesture or a glance of the eye. If under such circumstances there were a frank, self-conscious recognition by the child of the meaning of his reactions and this were openly communicated to the parent, the mischief would be easily remedied. But on the contrary, either the significance of the experience is concealed from the child, or his mood blocks a frank expression of it. Instead, there is a subterranean protest which breaks forth into jealousy.

The family could not function at all without creating conditions that foster a spirit of rivalry in children. The same is true of the school. In both institutions, however, any effort to exploit the competitive impulses of children even for purposes that are adjudged good is an exhibition of psychic malpractice on the part of adults. Anyone familiar with the pressure that is put upon children to compete with one another as a means of stirring them up and stimulating their aggressiveness will marvel that there is not more jealousy in children than usually occurs. The explanation sometimes is the lack of genuine interest on the part of the child and more frequently some self-discovered, therapeutic antidote which saves self-respect. The child will accept an inferiority position at one point because of the satisfaction he gets in being superior elsewhere. This discloses the task that falls upon the thoughtful adult who realizes the child is being hurt by his sense of failure in competition with others. When sensitivity, inferiority, and inability to find success through substitution combine to lower the personality's prestige, jealousy is to be expected.

Children do not always direct their jealousies against one another. Freudian literature has made much of the child's jealousy toward the parent of the same sex. The girl resents the attention her father gives the mother, and develops jealousy toward the parent who has become a sexual rival. Anyone familiar with family life has come across impressive incidents of the eagerness of the child, if given opportunity, to assume that he or she has taken or should take the place held by one parent in the affection of the other.[4] Such happenings need to be scrutinized carefully before they are pronounced expressions of jealousy, since they may be more akin to imitation or to a perfectly wholesome desire to be close to one parent in the absence or illness of the other. Nevertheless, when these exceptions are recognized, there remain authentic illustrations of the jealousy of the child toward one parent because of the desire to monopolize the affection of the other.

It certainly is not strange that such feelings come into the life of the young child if the parents exhibit openly their love for each other in such a way as to make the child feel that he is being left out or subordinated. Children are so quick to catch the drift of sentiment that parents do not need to go very far in overt actions to encourage jealousy in the observing child because of the open expression of affection for another. The danger is especially great whenever a parent makes love to one child in the presence of the other. Again, the expression may be slight, but if it conveys much meaning, any sensitive child not included is apt to take notice and react emotionally to the experience. One does not need to assume the Oedipus complex in such reactions to partisan love-making to explain the arousing of jealousy; any parent's discrimination or neglect in show of affection is in itself a sufficient cause. Always the significance of the experience must be found in the total situation.

Parents bring disappointment to themselves and trouble to

[4] Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, p. 219.

children by attemping to use one child to goad the other toward some desired objective. Sometimes a docile child is chosen and enthroned as a model. If he, possessing qualities that are supposed to be desirable, is merely a standard pattern for comparison, the reaction of other children will range from indifference to antagonism toward the one selected as an example; but if attachment through affection is involved, jealousy and hate are the common outcome. If an older child is contrasted with a younger, intense jealousy is quick to appear. Instead of the comparisons becoming a stimulus to greater activity in accord with the parent's idea, the reverse occurs as the older child reacts emotionally to the situation, either tending toward depression if self-negation predominates, or toward revenge if he is of the aggressive type.

Parents are most likely to attempt to use one child to stir up another in his schoolwork. The basis of comparison is usually grades, for parents generally have little realization of the arbitrariness, the artificiality, and the emotional bias of school grades. Assuming that the ranks can be taken seriously as educational measurements, the attempt to pit one child against another seldom fails to arouse jealousy and hate. Even when parents are too wise to make any comparison, the presence of an older and a younger child in the same grade becomes a socially menacing situation.

It is one of the liabilities of family interaction that it is so difficult for the parent who shows preference to gain the self-insight necessary to recognize that he is doing so. Instead he will insist that he feels the same toward all his children and treats them alike. He also is quick to deny that there is any jealousy between his children, and they in turn when questioned may give the same testimony.[5] There appears to be a conviction in the mind of the parent and possibly also of the children that where affection exists there cannot be jealousy or hate. Love is thought of as a consistency, always dominat-

[5] Mary B. Sayles, *The Problem Child at Home: A Study in Parent-Child Relationships*, p. 66.

ing the emotions of those who make up the family. On the contrary, in the child especially, love is intermittent, swayed by the existing state of self-feeling. A parent's attack upon the child's ego brings into consciousness feelings that are properly catalogued as hate rather than love. These momentary transformations of emotions come to the surface of consciousness even though the underlying emotional flow be that of affection. It is impressive to find that serious study of problem children has convinced the investigator that in every jealous situation studied, the child's belief that a brother or sister was preferred to him was based upon grounds that could not be denied.[6]

There is another situation not so common as those already mentioned that generates jealousy, often to such a degree that it becomes a dominant trait through life. The child that is made to feel that he was not wanted because his parents preferred a child of the opposite sex is given an injection of incitements to bitterness, not against a person but against fate. If later a child of the desired sex is born, jealousy may arise and take a personal form. In any case, the discovery of the parents' disappointment is a shock that penetrates the personality deeply.

The various forms that jealousy assumes once it becomes established must not hide the fact that there are always other emotional reactions associated with the experience that do not indicate their origin. Some of these are depression, discontent, predisposition to conflict, revolt against discipline, general suspicion, mischievous gossip, and even pathological lying and cruelty. Only investigation can trace backward from such overt acts to the underlying cause, jealousy nurtured in the bosom of the family.

Even in childhood there are illustrations of the carrying over of feelings of jealousy so that the sense of unfairness associated with the parent is transferred, for example, to a teacher. Rarely

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

does the latter have the insight to recognize that the feeling has been imported from a previous situation. As a consequence, a second attack upon the child through what seems unjust treatment discolors the school career. On the other hand, when such a transference is suspected by the instructor and handled with sympathy rather than harshness, there frequently occurs that quick reformation of social attitude familiar to the students of problem children. Any analysis of jealousy as it appears in the children of a family is likely to uncover the explanation in a parent's protest against the coming of the child or his dissatisfaction because the child does not bring the satisfaction, the fulfillment of pride, that had been anticipated. The unwanted pregnancy may become the starting point of feelings against the child which will exaggerate and aggravate his later failures even though love for him develops. This emotional dualism tempts parents to acts and words that bring jealousy into the life of the child. These expressions may come to the surface only occasionally, but even so, because they stand against the background of love, they may predispose the child to become jealous whenever any concrete situation arises against which he can react; for example, a second but welcomed birth.

Studies of jealousy among children

Familiar contact with children, particularly in the preschool period, brings to any observer impressive occurrences of jealousy. For the most part, they are instances similar to outbursts of anger and are perhaps more accurately described as jealous impulses than as jealousy. There are children, however, who show such a persistency of this reaction, such a frequency of its expression, that they are rightly defined as victims of jealousy. These more serious types have been studied. In the interpretation of such investigations, it is necessary to remember that nearly always any chronic emotional predisposition is too complex to be fully assigned to any particular

category. It is a total situation with multiple emotional consequences that requires analysis. This is true of jealousy, even though the dominant aggression can clearly be assigned to that emotion. In isolating that element and tracing its cause within the total situation, a step is taken from the particular to the general which, although necessary for the understanding of jealousy as a motivation, discards some of the significance, some of the meaning, of the child's behavior that is charged to the emotion. The diagnosis, although justified, is an emphasis of the major component, and therefore to do full justice to the complexity of the emotional stress, not jealousy as an exclusive source of causation but the total situation needs interpretation. This is true of both defensive and aggressive mechanisms, but must be especially kept in mind in the investigation of jealousy, since the mechanism stands out so definitely as to tempt oversimplicity of causal description.

Sewell has studied the behavior of a sampling of seventy children, under conditions associated with their reaction to the introduction of a new member into the family. Their responses varied but included exhibitions of jealousy, some attempting to attack the infant, some refusing to recognize its presence, and others denying that it belonged to the family. There were also personality changes in some of the children that resulted from the new emotional competition within the home. Among these were increased timidity, falling back upon daydreaming, and other forms of retreat. This study also brought out that the most noticeable reactions occurred between the ages of eighteen and forty-two months. Most important of all was the fact that jealousy, once established, tended to spread to other persons and situations. The child's loss of his one-time security and monopoly of affection, his recoil from emotional displacement—and this was greatly influenced by the previous practices of the parent—tended to be not an episode but a persisting influence upon his attitude toward life.[7]

[7] M. Sewell, "Some Causes of Jealousy in Young Children," *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, vol. 1, pp. 6-22.

Sybil Foster's study reveals the wide sweep of jealousy over the behavior of children. Her group included fifty children infected with jealousy, two-thirds of whom were girls. The largest number fell into the age-group of three to four years. Pugnacity and selfishness appeared noticeably, but the former very rarely went so far as to become cruelty. In addition to these traits of character there was a great range of changes showing how deep was the disturbance, trouble in sleeping, enuresis, fussing about food, destructiveness, and overactivity. Lying, stealing, and truancy occurred seldom. The families of these children gave evidence of marriage incompatibility, disagreement of the parents regarding discipline, and failure to give the child intelligent preparation for life. One-fifth of the children were subjected to teasing from some source.[8]

Jealousy in courtship

Jealousy is so apt to appear in courtship that it might seem to be a characteristic trait associated with the experience. It is, however, normally a seasonable expression which registers the insecurity of the relationship. There is the desire to possess the other, to monopolize affection—desires that naturally accompany the mating impulse. In contrast there is commonly an unwillingness to be so possessed until the interaction has led to a final commitment, a mutually chosen exclusiveness. Until this occurs, there are constant openings for the entrance of jealousy in the relationship. Indeed, expression of jealousy frequently becomes a card that is played in the effort to win attention and an eventual mutuality of love. Jealousy nevertheless complicates the progress of courtship. This is one of the reasons for the old adage that true love never runs smooth.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to distinguish between this jealousy, accompaniment of the insecurities of courtship, and

[8] Sybil Foster, "Study of the Personality Make-up and Social Setting of Fifty Jealous Children," *Mental Hygiene*, 11:53-77.

that menacing disposition to be jealous which has been carried out of childhood and has become a dominant trait of the personality. This second type of jealousy will not pass, once there has come about a mutual commitment. Instead, it will be carried forward throughout the relationship. It will function in marriage as in courtship, frequently with increasing dominance with the passing years.

The emotionalism associated with courtship makes difficult the discernment that is needed to distinguish between the ordinary expressions of jealousy due merely to the insecurity of the relationship and the eagerness of possession, and the more serious revelations of a chronic habit. It is not uncommon for one of the persons courted to enjoy the exhibitions of intense jealousy on the part of the other and to accept this as evidence of the strength of passion and affection. Only after marriage is there awakening to the fact that the partner has a deeply entrenched habit of jealousy and that even love does not free him from his suspicions and hostilities. He merely carries over into the new relationship a predisposition that has been nursed from early childhood.

Courtship generally gives plenty of warnings of this deeply laid susceptibility, but their meaning is lost to the man or woman who is responding to the strong attraction. If courtship did not ordinarily come at almost the onset of adulthood when interpretation has a slight background of experience, chronic jealousy would be more frequently detected. It would be noticed that jealousy is shown not merely within the confines of the courtship interest as a consequence of the insecurity of the relationship, but that it is directed against anyone who apparently encroaches upon the supersensitive ego.

The aftereffects of the two types of jealousy found in courtship are strikingly different. In the one case, marriage brings a cessation of the feeling, and the expressions of the spouse's previous attention to others are either forgotten or remain a pleasant memory, enhancing desirability. In the case of the other, the life-habit type of jealousy, there develops an increas-

ing resentment which spoils the memory of courtship and endangers the compatibility of the marriage relationship.

Adult jealousy within the family

Family ties can no more protect the person predisposed to jealousy from its expression than does affection in the case of the parent-child relationship. The forms the tendency takes are as many as the possible points of tension in family interaction. Some are common enough to be recognized as familiar clashings of personalities who are forced to maintain the intimacy of family life. Wives are jealous of their husband's vocational interest even to the point of becoming an obstruction to the latter's success. Sometimes such a feeling of resentment is a perfectly reasonable protest against an unintelligent concentration on out-of-the-family interests and a neglect of the home. There are, however, wives who find in the occupation, the success, or the prestige of the husband a competition that antagonizes them and makes them feel they are being injured. This is not always conscious, being frequently repressed because it is so contrary to the approved code, but its strength is not thereby lessened. Often the jealousy is rationalized so that it is elevated to a moral justification against what is defined as the selfishness or indifference of the husband. Sometimes the jealousy is rooted in a previously developed feeling of being discriminated against on account of sex, as if the husband personifies the male, and the work he does is adversely contrasted with the tasks and the limitations placed upon the wife.

The husband also finds numerous occasions that awaken the feelings of jealousy to which he has become susceptible. The attention that other men or women show to his wife may stir his emotions. In some cases, wives have been obliged to strip themselves of all friendships, even with members of their own sex, in order to enjoy a degree of marital peace. Husbands sometimes react against the superior social position of the wife or of the wife's parents. In a recent case, the reputation of

the wife's father and the distinction it brought acted as a continuous source of rage on the part of the husband to whom enmity against his in-laws had become an obsession. Although this was the only significant cause of incompatibility, the wife was eventually driven to seek a divorce.

Experience demonstrates that the prevailing code of masculine dominance makes it difficult for many, perhaps most, husbands to accept a wife's superior vocational position. This has to be reckoned with by a woman who pursues a career that may bring her greater salary, or prestige, or a larger opportunity than comes to the husband. Certainly not all husbands that react against such a situation are guilty of chronic jealousy. On the other hand, there are some who are quick to read into any success or opportunity of the wife personal discrimination or inferiority and to react against it aggressively in the spirit of jealousy. It is doubly hazardous for a woman of much talent to engage in the same business or profession as the husband where any distinction that comes to her will be contrasted by the husband with his own position. The working together of a man and woman as partners in a similar line of endeavor is a supreme test of the freedom of both of them from any tendency to jealousy.

Family interaction discloses that husbands and wives show jealousy against the other spouse because of his or her fellowship with their child. Again it proves true that affection is no proof against resentment and jealousy. This reaction is sometimes so strong that the coming of a child ends forever the previous compatibility of husband and wife.

A considerable amount of jealousy within the family is associated with sex. There are women who destroy their ability to respond to sexual stimulation because of jealousy directed against men in general or the husband in particular, and who cannot abide the more active part of the male in sexual relationship. This sometimes means that the only possibility of the wife's having an orgasm comes from her taking over the position of dominance in the intimacy, so that she acts the part of the male.

A more common form of sex jealousy results from an extraordinary readiness to regard any attention that the husband or wife receives as evidence of sexual attraction. Men and women who suffer from this habit of jealousy in the spouse have been known to accept social isolation rather than endanger the very existence of their home. This price they sometimes are willing to pay for a degree of security because of their children. Occasionally in such circumstances, once the children have grown up so as to maintain themselves, the husband or more frequently the wife quickly seeks the divorce which on account of economic or social reasons has been foregone during the previous years.

One of the liabilities of monogamic marriage is the fact that it depends for its stability upon a code that attempts to concentrate love and passion. The strength of this conventional pressure varies with classes and with cultural groups. There is, for example, in the strength of this enforcement a great difference between France and Ireland. France again shows how great the difference may be between classes. Allowing for these variations, it remains true that monogamy, as compared with any form of polygamy, emphasizes the concentration of affection and physical passion, idealizing a monopoly of sexual relationship. Plural marriage, on the contrary, forbids this ideal of a mutual exclusiveness of sex. There are, of course, among primitive peoples illustrations of monogamic marriage codes where this sense of mutual possession is faint. Nevertheless, inherent in the monogamic trend is the tendency toward a mutually restricted sex experience. Prostitution and the double standard, however, reveal how resistant human nature, especially in the male, has been to the demands of the monogamic ideal.

The monogamic code opens the way for the expression of chronic jealousy. The husband or wife who has had embedded in character a predisposition toward jealousy finds favorable opportunity for suspicion and resentment in the social happenings that he or she is so ready to interpret as sexual rivalry.

The mere glance of an eye, ordinary courtesy, responses forced by the necessity of being polite, are magnified to a false significance and then reacted to with a luxury of jealous emotion. If there is any difficulty of response or any dissatisfaction in the marital relationship, there is all the more encouragement to look for occurrences that can be given a jealous interpretation.

Such jealousy can look back to the past as well as forward to the future. The spouse may persist in demands that the premarriage sex career of the other be confessed in detail; then the rehearsal is distorted and made a persistent source of jealous feeling. The reaction is subjectively determined. Trivial occurrences of friendly comradeship before marriage may become grounds for reproach or suspicion as certainly as an actual loss of virginity. In such a case the sexual monotony that is so common in monogamic marriages brings its hazards. The sex impulse seeks relief in some degree of promiscuity, with the consequence, along with other influences, that there is an awakening or reawakening of jealousy and a complete breakdown of compatibility.

Jealousy as social motivation

Jealousy is so socially disturbing that it is frowned upon in the family and outlawed by the group through public opinion. When looked at as to its significance for interaction, it appears as maladjustment, a miscarriage of relationship due to the victim's incapacity to free himself from the sense of attack. This subjective interference distorts the meaning of his contacts, driving in upon consciousness a feeling of injury which is aggressively resented. It is important, however, in any effort to recognize its social significance that it be thought of not as a vice alien to human motivation, but as a potential by-product of any social relationship which has meaning for the individual. The self cannot objectively adjust to persons as it may to things, but must in all such relationships obtain self-values from the association. This seeking of meaning impels to comparison, to

inferiority feeling, to loss of prestige, to jealousy, as well as to satisfying interaction.

When looked at from this angle, both inferiority and jealousy are subjective reactions in emotional form to a sense of failure in the survival process. In the one case, the flaw is accepted as something belonging to the self; in the other case, it is regarded as a fault of others. There cannot be, however, social activity that brings conscious meaning to those interacting upon one another without the liability of individual failures bringing either the sense of incapacity or of unfair treatment. It is a hazard of self-conscious relationship, rather than an alien accretion to human nature. Its frequent occurrence in the family is a consequence of an association charged with potential emotion. The liability of the child comes from his sensitivity to family contacts, but without this interaction with others there would be no incentives for growth.

It is customary to place a great gulf between jealousy and rivalry, but as a matter of fact intense rivalry and mild jealousy come close together. The distinction cannot be found in the act of appraising one's self in comparison with others, but in the emotional reaction that accompanies such judgment. In the case of rivalry, there is eagerness to excel, but the feeling of being attacked is absent. There is likewise a difference in the result of the two experiences. Society profits from rivalry and encourages it; society is liable to be hurt by jealousy and discourages it. These contrary programs appear in family life in an intimacy of relationship that makes especially clear the hazards of rivalry and the ease with which such stimulation can be turned into incitements to jealousy.

What happens in the family occurs also in the larger grouping, society, but under conditions that somewhat conceal the dangers of emphasizing rivalry. Family experience provides clues for understanding the two contrary trends that appear in civilization. A society that fixes individual status also lessens competition, provides a traditional career for the individual, escapes the emotional hazards of attempts to move from one

class to another, diminishes the jealousy of groups and individuals, but at the expense of progress. On the other hand, a society that provides passageway for the individual to go upward or downward in social status, that enhances competition and approves rivalry, especially in the educational career, brings forth social restlessness, rapid change, and the conditions for progress.

However disparate these two trends appear in any survey of various societies, their differences are only relative. In the most primitive society one finds the group ingeniously utilizing the individual's eagerness to excel, his unwillingness to be left behind, just because the family takes advantage of the motive provided by the child's readiness to respond to rivalry. The area in which the very simple society may permit individual competition may be extremely narrow—for example, hunting, fishing, or agriculture.

An impressive illustration of such a society's profitable manipulation of rivalry is the Trobriands' interest in gardening and the ambition of every male to excel in agricultural productiveness. Each gardener realizes that his reputation largely depends upon the size of his garden and the efficiency with which he cultivates it.[9] The same people show how close feelings of hostility characteristic of jealousy are to any special stress of rivalry. The different villages challenge each other to exhibits of garden products. According to tradition, the winner has the right to destroy the inferior yams belonging to the defeated competitors. However when this privilege is exercised, a fight is the almost inevitable result of the competition.[10]

The family struggles to reduce the propensity of its members toward rivalry with each other in order to strengthen the unity of the relationship. This policy can safely be maintained because the members of the family as they go outward into their various occupations have plenty of opportunity to express their competitive desires, but with less emotional risk than

[9] Ellis Silas, *A Primitive Arcadia*, p. 166.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 170.

when any contest occurs within the family. It is the close contact and the emotional meaning of the relationship of the family which determine the hazards of rivalry, which has social implications not only for other institutions, but for society itself in its broadest aspects. Jealousy becomes the aggressive reaction to a rivalry of individuals who maintain personal interactions and who have at stake, in their comparisons and competitions, self-status.

Domestic dominance

The desire to dominate is another aggression born of experience that early stimulated self-regard; but dominance achieves a greater environmental success than jealousy, and the form it takes is more profitable to society and more often approved by public opinion. Its outward accomplishments veil the fact that, so far as the self is concerned, passion for power is an emotional perversion as certainly as is jealousy. Success may be attained again and again, but the desire to push ahead remains unsatiated. In spite of the external accomplishments, often involving struggle with others, ingenuity, insight, skill, and courage, the real battlefield remains within the self, and there, no victory is ever won.

Domestic relations provide for this passion the same opportunities that are made use of by mechanisms already discussed. The family may be exploited so that it is chiefly a relationship in which dominance and superiority are successfully maintained. The individual in his other relationships may be thwarted, obliged to hide his consuming passion, but in the home he can ascend the throne. Only then does his personality find the freedom to reveal his fundamental traits. In his out-of-the-family relationships he may feel a jealousy which only occasionally in subterranean ways would he dare express. If so, his ability to dominate in the home becomes an antidote. His domestic career may be an expression of will-to-power; it may also contain sadistic elements so that he is cruel not only because

of his desire to demonstrate his authority and position, but also because crushing others is in itself pleasurable. When he has a choice between taking command with the acquiescence of his helpless inferiors or gaining it by struggle, he may prefer the second because of the satisfaction that comes not merely from gaining and keeping his power but from hurting others in the process.

Dominance is of all the mechanisms most easily concealed by rationalization. The fact that objectively its results are socially approved makes it easy for the victim of the perversion to justify what he does. "Spare the rod and spoil the child" is a commonly chosen defense for utterly cruel, destructive, and ineffective forms of discipline carried on by the parent who is so caught by his love of power that he is impelled to enslave his own child. Another frequent rationalization which attempts to cover up psychopathic dominance in a domestic relation is the statement that every family must have a head. This again is an attempt to justify the suppression of the individualism of others, that the husband or wife may make use of family relationships in the continuous but futile effort to gain a satisfaction that will content the emotionally driven victim.

Domestic dominance appears most frequently in the attitude of parents toward their children. A thwarted personality charged with social ambitions that are or appear to be hopeless, forced to accept what is interpreted as a mediocre existence, attains a sense of superiority, a taste of emotional sovereignty, through commanding the defenseless children. Unless this takes some extraordinary, cruel form, it brings no public censure. Indeed, it may be applauded by like-minded observers. Here we find the most common and the most dangerous immorality of the parent. For the same reasons, the child becomes a similar challenge to the emotional soundness of the teacher who may have an equal hunger for power and the same temptation to use a superior position to exploit the weakness of inferiors, and who, like the parent, can conceal even from himself his quest for dominance by rationalizations that cover up the egoistic motivation.

The tyranny of a spouse is not so readily disguised. It is usually detected by those who come in contact with the dominated family and is disapproved. This condemnation, however, is much stronger when the female dominates the male than the reverse. This, of course, merely means that the patriarchal conventions are standardized to a masculine dominance that is approved until it becomes strikingly excessive. In-law tyranny is also quickly recognized and frowned upon. This protest appears in impressive form on primitive levels of culture. Here it is the mother-in-law who is looked upon as a potential danger whose noninterference needs to be assured by taboo.[11] The various codes of avoidance cannot be forced into the single explanation that they attempt to protect against dominance through influence and position, as W. I. Thomas suggests, but even if mother-in-law avoidance is not always "a preservative application of a device for denoting relationship" this is its most common motive and its practical result.[12]

In modern life, one finds devious and subtle ways of coercion, such as illness, especially in some form of "nerves," and sex and finances used as means of gaining a superiority over the husband or wife, who is driven, in order to escape other inflictions, to accept and endure subordination.[13]

[11] Ernest Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, pp. 399-414.
[12] *Primitive Behavior*, p. 214.
[13] Abraham Myerson, *The Nervous Housewife*, chap. IX.

XVI. *The Family and the Defensive Mechanisms*

THE FAMILY AND EMOTIONAL RETREAT. There is no better illustration that mental abnormality means excess than is found in the meaning of emotional retreat. Nothing is more characteristic of the biologic organism than to withdraw from an unpleasant environment. The forbidding circumstances stimulate recoil. It is the purpose of pain, for example, to force attention to conditions that endanger life so that, if possible, the organism will free itself from a dangerous situation. The instinctiveness of this withdrawal appears clearly in a child's shrinking from such an experience as having a splinter removed from his finger. Almost in spite of himself he draws away, or at least his hand moves, if free, from the needle that is about to prick him. This withdrawal is so normal and so frequently experienced by all of us in its various forms that it would be absurd to think of it as an abnormality per se. When this impulse to withdraw from unpleasant or menacing circumstances is carried over into the emotional realm, it does not necessarily become a form of mental unsoundness. The opposite would be true. Clinging to painful emotional experiences is at least indication that the individual has started walking the highway that leads to some sort of psychic abnormality.

In spite of the fact that the impulse to move away from pain-giving conditions is as normal for the human personality as for the simplest protoplasm, it is nevertheless true that this movement away provides a possible source of mental unsoundness and one that employs the emotional resources of marriage and the family for its expression. When this occurs we find

that there is some form of interference by the subjective incentives with the existing objective realities. The individual victimized by these perversions of self-consciousness seeks, if he can, to cut himself off from the environment and by encircling himself with egocentric protection to replace pain with pleasure. Barriers are erected to shut out the unfavorable circumstances, but this of course means that there is a breaking of the connection between the self and the environment, a contact which is indispensable for human survival, just as it is for that of any other living organism. The fact that this self-made seclusion takes place within the emotions does not lessen its abnormal significance, for the blockade against reality that the emotions establish passes beyond its sphere of origin and lessens the vital environmental contact. The retreat may be essentially emotional; nevertheless, it carries the individual as a total personality away from a fact-facing environmental contact toward a distortion of reality that spells danger.

When the retreat processes are subjected to analysis for the purpose of determining when one steps out of the normal into the abnormal in the desire to retreat, it appears that one evidence of unsoundness is excessiveness. The child's natural tendency to withdraw his finger when he fears being hurt is one thing; an overwhelming panic with intense struggle and a hysterical outburst is something different. The first is to be expected as a natural consequence of the idea of being hurt; the other requires an explanation since it obviously has behind it emotional occurrences, possibly emotional habits, that are the real cause of the extraordinary disturbance. As is true in such a simple childhood happening, so also in the more complex emotional traits there has to be recognition of the difference between an average reaction to environmental unpleasantness and a tremendous emotional recoil which gives evidence that the individual's career has predisposed him to the unreasonable emotional recoil. Thus it is that the quantity of the reaction determines its quality, and therefore it can be classified as normal in one case and abnormal in the other. The judgment is of

course not such as comes from precise measurement, but in most cases the neutral observer safely assigns the behavior to its proper classification.

Excessiveness is not the only evidence of abnormal retreating. When the withdrawal indicates failure to attempt to cope with a painful social situation that is insistent we again define the action as abnormal. The test is as definite as it has to be in the physical contact. The organism that cannot meet the demands of its environment suffers.

The emotionally coerced individual who does not make effort to conquer the unpleasant circumstances that press upon him, but who instead runs away from the task, is on the highway that leads to abnormality. The distance he has traveled must be determined both in regard to the character of his environmental difficulties, the measure of his success in forcing out of consciousness that to which he ought to attend, and the significance of his behavior as it is reflective of, or contrary to, his usual reactions. It is not irrational to run away from an unfavorable situation when there is a way of escape. Even the physical body is organized to do this with greater energy than is expended in ordinary activities.[1] Its ability to do this under stress is a product of evolution, an endocrine equipment which man shares with the higher animals. The abnormality appears when this retreating is fictitious. The environmental conditions are not in fact left behind but are merely ignored by a subjective withdrawal that is essentially a self-deception.

There is, of course, great difference between an irrational act as a person encounters hard circumstances and a firmly established habit of retreating whenever the individual finds himself in such a predicament. It is this habitual withdrawal, this tendency to have recourse to subjective concealment of difficulties, that characterizes the victims of emotional retreat. Their disposition to run away has become a chronic, automatic impulse, that goes into action whenever they are pressed upon

[1] Walter B. Cannon, *The Wisdom of the Body*, pp. 212-213.

by environment. As a consequence, they are unable to meet the demands of adequate adjustment to life, and their mental functions are enlisted not only in protecting them from the task of effective adaptation to life, but also in protecting them from a frank acknowledgment of their habit of retreat. Not only must they, for self-respect, cover up what has become a characteristic trait of their personality, but in order to accomplish this they must make use of all the resources they can subjectively manipulate, and among these are family relationships. It may be the husband-wife interactions or the parent-child contacts that are made use of, or both of them. The program adopted will depend upon the opportunity that the family provides.

The means of control of the domestic relationships is most commonly an exploitation of the affection of spouse or child or parent. It is obvious that the strong emotion, love, provides the most effective attack upon the personality that is chosen to help build up the subjective defenses against life. It would be folly to attempt to manipulate those over whom the chronic retreater has no power. On the contrary, he who seeks to use others for his self-assurance must have some hold over them. Ordinarily this means either financial or love dominance.

The ease with which we find domestic affection exploited indicates not that loveless relationships would be socially desirable, but rather that any powerful incentive nurtured in intimate, familiar relationship can, when put to unsound purposes, become a liability to successful adjustment to life rather than an asset. The only way of removing the potential danger of affectionate fellowship would be to take from it its essential emotional value. It also is an evolutionary product, an achievement that has come from deepening and refining the instinctive commitment that we find at least seasonably expressed in the animal relationships of mother and offspring.

To insist that the ties of affection are in themselves either a necessary good or ill is to forget that the quality of the relation-

ship cannot be found in its strength but rather in its effect in the concrete interactions of the two persons who are bound together by the emotion. When this is recognized, one escapes the bias of those who are insistent that the family, because of its potential love and hate, is necessarily sound or unsound in its functioning as a social institution. The test has to be more specific and, although at any time or place there may be a trend which makes average family life subject to a general description, the evidence of this must always be gathered from examining the social contributions of individual families. Any effort to measure the significance of these contributions is made difficult by the fact that at no moment can the situation in regard to any particular family be regarded as final. Family interaction is a historic process, and although major trends in what happens to be true in the complexity of relationships may seem to the observer certain to continue, time alone can prove or disprove his expectations. This fact does not prevent us from localizing the potential dangers of familial experience, such as the development during the growth of personality of the habit of running away instead of meeting the demands of environment.[2] It is only when dogmatism turns to prophecy in the analysis of specific family relations that the observer needs to keep in mind the difference in certainty between diagnosis and prognosis.

Liabilities of parental influence

One of the greatest influences helping to shape the independence and self-reliance of the growing child is the character and example of the parents. Instead of being a unity of impression from both parents, this may come predominantly from one. It is possible, on the other hand, for two inconsistent influences to enter the life of the child, one bringing an emotional demand for self-confidence and initiative, while at the

[2] Phyllis Blanchard, "Reading Disabilities in Relation to Difficulties of Personality and Emotional Development," *Mental Hygiene*, 20:1-30.

same time there is an intense desire for security through dependency. Such a start prophesies a tragic adult experience, the individual being driven by inner incentives in two opposite directions and rarely achieving any degree of self-content, whatever his prevailing disposition, in later life. More commonly the child develops in accord with what might be called the composite of the parental qualities of self-reliance and independence. The tie of parent and child through affection naturally encourages the latter's seeking to follow after his parents. This social imitation does not, however, rule out the contributions of inheritance. The child may find it all the easier to copy the example of his parents because his inheritance is similar to theirs and inclines him toward the same tendencies of dependency or independence that have been the parental characteristics.[3]

When there is a divorcement between the instruction and the ideals presented by the parents and their behavior, the latter has the greater molding influence so far as the child's behavior is concerned. On the other hand, the preachments of the parents may implant feelings of obligation which will tend to create in the later life emotional conflict as the individual tends to practice dependency while his approved standards insist upon independence and self-reliance. This inner division may be emotionally solved in a variety of ways. The most common attempt to gain relief from such inner tension is by building a compartment-life and idealizing or even crusading for certain high standards of conduct while practicing in everyday contacts just the opposite. This program can of course be carried into family life, accentuating in another generation the same discordant influences that operated upon the parent when he was a child.

The possibilities of the influences of parents are too complex to permit establishing a formula so that one can say with certainty what must happen in any particular parent-child interactions. Instead of the child's following the pathway of the

[3] J. C. Flügel, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family*, p. 62.

parent toward a high degree of self-reliance, he may move in an opposite direction because the parent's aggressiveness may undermine the qualities of self-respect, self-confidence, and experiences of self-expression that are necessary as a basis for the development of a life of adult independence. In such cases, the success of the parents overshadows the child, who may by constantly comparing himself with the parent build chronic discouragement. Or instead he may seek relief by repudiating the parent and establishing an emotional hostility to examples that he does not find himself able to imitate. In this latter reaction, the possibility of affection turning to hate is always present.

There is another situation in which we have the causal influences acting in an opposite way. The child may react against the parents' weakness, his or her inability to cope with life, and by the absolute necessity of doing things for himself may through his struggles build a dominant personality that stands forth in striking unlikeness to that of his parents or to the parent toward whom his affection has most strongly flowed. This happens frequently enough to give substance to a common belief that very successful parents have weak children and that the most aggressive and self-assured personalities develop in homes where there has been emotional weakness rather than strength. In judging the cases that seem to illustrate these generalizations, one must keep in mind the attention such instances draw, the contrast itself being impressive. We are on safe ground only when we recognize that in the development of the total personality, so far as life-habits of dependency or independence are concerned, not only does the family as a social organization have a great part in bringing about the characteristic traits but also that any attempt at understanding individuals requires scrutinizing the parent-child relationship, which frequently consists of the emotional reactions to one parent during the formative period of the offspring.

The emotional commitment of the child may go so far as to bring about identification. This leads to the quintessence of

life-dependency. The child as he develops seeks not only to continue his emotional commitment to the parent but also in all his social relationships to find in others a similar attachment. Since this is not possible because the parent cannot be duplicated, life is driven toward a hopeless quest and emotional frustration that forbid realistic association with others. The emotional tyranny of parents may be so firmly entrenched that it persists even after the parent dies and the victim, believing himself free at last, marries. The fixation not only influences the mating but establishes an artificial setting for domestic interaction.

Childhood overprotection and retreat

One of the chief purposes of the instinctive commitment of the mother and offspring in the higher animal life is protection of the younger and weaker by the older and stronger. Parental protection is likewise a normal by-product of the affection that among human beings takes over and enlarges the instinct that is sufficient to safeguard the dependent animal during its period of infancy, but the addition of self-consciousness opens the way for excesses in this caretaking of the human parent. Emotion does not encounter the barriers that the seasonable functioning of animal instincts impose, with the consequence that both the memory and the imagination can so spread the feelings generated by the parent-child contacts and responses that a family program is possible that perpetuates the dependency of infancy, and the protection given the child in his early years is carried onward and merely refashioned as he grows in years.

One expression of this inability of the parent to travel outside the emotions attained with his first experiences of parenthood is a maneuvering that seeks to isolate the child emotionally in as great a measure as possible that there may be a continuation of his need of the support of the parent. It is rare indeed that we find such a program made deliberately or consciously with the frank admission that the prolonging of infancy is

desired. Nevertheless a very common reaction frequently stated in the words of the parent, that he cannot accustom himself to the rapid way the child is growing up, shows how near to the common experience are the motivations that lead him to attempt overprotection of the child. This appears when the situation is looked at in reverse, and the parent's surprise or hostility to the increasing demand for independence on the part of the developing child is examined. Thus it is that affection tends to betray the purposes of human parenthood and leads the older to attempt a conspiracy against the emotional self-maturity of the younger who seeks to emerge from his clinging to the parent.

The method of isolating the child favored by some parents is to keep him from forming satisfying, confident associations with persons that might become rivals. This may mean creating in the child a suspicion so that he never dares let himself go in the presence of others outside the home. On the other hand, insignificant shyness and self-consciousness may be so noticed and manipulated as to create a chronic tendency of withdrawal. The result is that the parent comes close to the monopoly that is the underlying purpose of his policy. The child keeps to the parent not so much because of a continuation of his desire to have an exclusive love but because he has a chronic fear of intimacy outside the home.

It is fortunate that the play-cravings of the child frequently prevent this exploitation by his elders, so that he at least is drawn toward those of his own age through common interests. Although the associations may not generate affection they do bring him a comradeship which rivals that of his parents. It might seem that this strong need of playmates would be sufficient always to provide an antidote against a policy of domestic concentration. That it does not always accomplish this safeguarding reveals how profound the emotional attachment of parent and child may become. Play may be only a convenience that in no degree rivals the monopoly of relationship that the parent has established.

Fear and dependency

The family may smother the selfhood of the child by a different program. The attack may be made by creating fear not only of persons but of life itself. The child may be conditioned toward a timidity that forces him to accept alliance with his parents in every sphere of his activity. He may, for example, be constantly turned to the parent in his limited play-contacts, leaning upon parental experience whenever any demand is made upon his self-reliance. This type of dependency frequently develops slowly and unobtrusively. The parent merely stands by when the child plays with others, accepting any opportunity to inject himself into the association of the children. In the school period the parent may carry out the same emotional guardianship. That this often happens appears in the testimony of timid children who in their autobiographical material reveal how hurt and embarrassed they have been during their school life by intrusions and interferences of parents. They have suffered and recoiled but in many cases have through previous conditioning lost the strength of character necessary for a successful breaking away.

Childhood illness and protection

The illnesses to which children are susceptible bring an emotional hazard as well as a physical risk. Sickness provides a special opportunity for the deepening of dependency and the retarding of growth toward self-reliance. It brings temptation to the parent and to the child alike; to the parent by the anxiety it produces and the special attention it invites, and to the child by the unnatural sense of weakness it invokes while at the same time it impels to a more intense clinging to the security that affection offers. The sense of danger that accompanies illness depends upon the sensitiveness of parent and child to previous occurrences, and the seriousness with which the experience is interpreted. This estimation is not usually objectively deter-

mined but is a product of subjective emotion. As a consequence the significance of the child's condition can be greatly overestimated. The tendency is strong in this direction in the case of the first or the only child among parents predisposed toward worry. Only a parent, keenly imaginative, who has seen his child dangerously ill knows through experience the strength of the desire to protect. The risk of carrying this impulse to an excess that gives the child overprotection makes such illnesses a severe strain on parental judgment and restraint.

When the child becomes a victim of chronic illness or is burdened with some persistent handicap, there is a continuous incentive toward an exaggeration of the parent-child relationship whenever there is strong affection and a sensitive reaction to the situation. The conditions then are favorable to the creation of a continuing dependency in the child and a willingness to accept this by the parent. Undoubtedly it is often true that the physiological experience of the child reinforces this psychic attitude of dependency. His physiological conditions and his emotions work hand in hand to throw him into the arms of the parent for security. Illness, with its pain, its weakness, and its fears, encourages both the adult and the child to accept outside support in a way that would not occur ordinarily in a state of health. As a consequence, serious illness has to be regarded in the development of the child as being potentially as dangerous to psychic health as it is to the biologic organism.

The normal hazards of childhood illnesses are greatly multiplied whenever there is a predisposition in the parent to use every opportunity possible to maintain the child's feeling of dependency. The parent may through rationalization skillfully use the situation provided by the sickness to build in the child timidity so as to enfeeble his normal impulses toward self-assertion and independence. Then illness, even though it has become only a memory, persists emotionally and clouds the development of personality. The parent may be so grasping as to seize even slight illnesses and by exaggeration provide artificially the desired opportunity to captivate the child and

hold him in emotional submission. If this exploitation is believed impossible where there is genuine love, the answer is that affection by itself constitutes no protection. There has to be in addition insight and self-discipline on the part of the parent since love per se is not an adequate defense against the temptations that accompany illnesses or disabilities of the child.

The physician frequently recognizes the advantage of removing the sick child from the home and placing him in a hospital because this means separation from the parent and under the circumstances favors the recovery of the child. It is not merely providing routine, skill, and equipment. The child is saved the emotional attacks that add to the strain that the physical organism has to meet. Even children have been known to recognize this and to seek relief from the disturbing parent, exclaiming, "Please go away, Mama," although of course such a reaction is rare. In the same way that the hospital setting furnishes a barrier against parental outbursts, nervously harmful, so it also helps to save the child from risks accompanying the period of necessary dependency. The nurse and doctor easily become temporary rivals of the parent and, by providing emotional competition during the time of weakness and suffering, safeguard both child and parent.

It is often true that convalescence furnishes a greater danger than the earlier serious sickness. As pain and weakness disappear, consciousness has greater freedom to turn toward outer support. There is more energy and therefore more attention to others. With this growth of environmental sensitiveness there may develop an intense eagerness to experience the security that the relieved parent is so ready to give. As the physician withdraws, the parent has greater freedom to encourage the child's feeling of dependency.

Marriage and family incentives to dependency relationships

The wide area of familial experience, the motivations and expectations it arouses, the discipline and adjustment it demands

make it a prolific source of frustration.[4] This is true also of marriage, where there is apt to be even greater consciousness of expectation, and if disappointment occurs, even deeper feelings of frustration. The domestic situation not only provides the causes of frustration but also opens up a means of expression for dissatisfaction and bitterness. One of the results of such an experience is a hostility that comes out in aggression, very frequently against a spouse when the trouble is in marriage, and against a parent or a child when the maladjustment appears in family relationships. When the frustration is felt by the parent, one consequence that frequently shows itself in case histories is the attempt to use the child as a means of relief. Frustration carries with it a sense of loss and emptiness, and when this feeling of void persists, the parent is tempted to find fulfillment or at least a sublimating substitution through an exaggeration of the dependency responses of the child.

The parent seeks to hold the child in a status that brings comfort and egoistic fulfillment. Aggressiveness is not absent from the parent's program. But more significant in its effect upon the child is the parent's craving for responses that will lessen the tension coming from feelings of neglect, ill-treatment, or disappointment. However therapeutic this may be as an effort on the part of the parent to free himself from frustration, it is, so far as the child is concerned, hazardous because it is so apt to lead to an effort to maintain unseasonable dependency.

If the sympathy of the child is enlisted, there is all the more danger that the closeness of the parent and child will establish fixation. Fundamentally, both parties to the association are building dependency. The parent looks to the child to replace emotional loss; the child in turn becomes emotionally parasitic, gaining a large part of his satisfactions through the parent instead of directly by his own effort. It helps in appreciating the risk of such a situation to notice how native the desire for support

[4] John Dollard, *Frustration and Aggression*, pp. 72-76.

is to average human nature, how frequently it shows itself, especially in religious motivation. It is not something alien which is grafted on to the substance of personality but a normal need which, when given special stimulation, easily becomes a menace to successful adjustment to life.

Marriage and dependency

The relation between marriage and emotional dependency appears often enough to deserve interpretation. Since marriage is a choice it may be sought as a means of rehearsal of an earlier experience of dependency or fixation. The spouse is selected as a candidate for perpetuating the former situation which in childhood became responsible for the character trait of emotional parasitism. Influences that direct the mating impulse are so subtle and as a rule so far from a clear, conscious recognition that the desire for a transfer of former fixation experiences easily becomes the underlying cause of attraction. There is only a step from this marriage motive to frustration. It is only necessary for the spouse to prove unsatisfactory as an emotional support, a disappointment that is interpreted as deception rather than self-deception. The emotional outcome of this misadventure will depend upon the total personality of the one who fails to find in the other the fulfillment that had been anticipated. When there are no children, aggression gets greater emphasis because the means of relief the parent may seize is denied.

There is a different approach to marriage which is also a disposition carried over from the earlier child-parent relationship. A spouse may be chosen in order that there may be an escape from parental dominance. This overlording may have been either an oppression or an attempt to establish dependency. In either case, the resentment has had strong enough establishment to influence the mating. It does not matter, of course, whether the reaction that has been carried out of childhood is justified, objectively appraised, or not, the mood and the conviction are sufficient.

These two opposite incentives when woven into a larger complexity of attraction act as reinforcement in a comradeship mutually compatible. If, however, either has a decisive place in the association, marital adjustment is perverted. Domestic experience is then forced to carry an unnatural function. The spouse who has been chosen as an emotional victim has thrown upon him a role that he must fulfill or seem a failure. Under the most fortunate circumstances, such an assignment would be impossible of success since no one can persistently act as another; but since it is a blind commission for one and usually not consciously defined by the other member of the marital relationship, failure quickly comes and with it a feeling of disillusionment on the part of the one who has entered marriage for the purpose of duplicating the earlier emotional patterns of relationship. The greater the sense of disappointment, the stronger the desire to enjoy again the previous security. The sympathetic contacts with the spouse lessen and the emotional commitment to the past deepens.

Inferiority feeling and marriage and the family

Unseasonable dependency is rooted in inadequacy. Since it is the continuation beyond its proper period of a relationship that is necessary, it grows into excess or is unduly prolonged without sharp emotional reaction. Inferiority feeling, on the contrary, although it also is a product of inadequacy, develops not as a matter of course but with a chronic sense of dissatisfaction. It therefore produces an emotional discontent which stands in contrast with the restful clinging to dependency relationships and brings emotional disturbances of which the victim becomes aware. One of these is power-craving, and the other, jealousy.

The craving for power born of inadequacy is the natural striving of the personality for compensation. It is a therapeutic incentive that has its counterpart in the physiological processes of a body that has to adjust itself to some structural defect or

functional inadequacy of one of its organs. The body is equipped to make such changes, that it may carry on in spite of the failure of some individual part to function properly. One of the most common examples is the way in which the heart compensates for some chronic weakness or disability. The total personality likewise attempts to compensate for a handicap, real or fictitious, that has received emotional recognition. Psychically and socially this represents a conserving effort of self-consciousness similar to the phenomena of body adjustment so frequently recognized by the physician and the surgeon. Not only is compensation psychically therapeutic but it is also socially beneficial so long as it does not lead to the excess which is known as overcompensation.

The biological organism is equipped to attempt a necessary compensation, and ordinarily when this has been accomplished additional changes cease, and the new adjustment becomes an established pattern of behavior. On the contrary, self-consciousness erects no barriers to a compensating effort, with the result that there is nothing to hold the desire for power in proportion to the defect or weakness against which the emotions are reacting. Indeed, this emancipation of self-consciousness is what makes the difference between psychic and social compensation and the physical readjustments of the body. The two types of processes have the same purpose and the same origin, but comparison can be carried no farther. As the body tends to check overcompensation, self-consciousness invites it. There is, for example, nothing in the emotional drive to save the short man, self-conscious of his stature, or a child suffering from the belief that he has a speech defect, from going too far in a positive program for social recognition. In psychic and social experience it is the feeling of inadequacy that demands compensation. So long as this feeling remains a causal source of activity, it can provide pressure for egoistic satisfactions that will carry behavior to such excesses as to defeat the purpose of the aggressive stirring, leading to reactions from others that will all the more stimulate the feelings of inferiority, with the

consequence that still greater attempt is made to achieve compensation.

Human experience reveals that there is a wide range in the causes of inferiority feeling. The analysis of personality formation also shows that inferiority feeling can originate without a genuine objective situation to call it forth. It may be largely or even wholly a product of the imagination.[5]

Psychoanalytic investigation demonstrates what one would assume, that childhood is the originating period of feelings of inferiority. As the personality grows toward its adult characteristics, it is open to influences that establish that sense of inadequacy in which a final inferiority complex becomes rooted. No child as he develops can be saved from a collision between his self-esteem and circumstances that curb or attack his attempts to fulfill his egoistic expectations. Restrictions and defeats are a necessary part of his socialization. This fact, however, does not prevent any individual from experiences that go farther than merely to blockade desire. Instead of learning self-discipline, he may so react emotionally to his defeats as to beget a feeling of inferiority. Once this is established, it provides an emotional predisposition to similar experiences until it becomes an important, even a dominant, trait.

Although in any analysis of character we have to look backward to childhood as the time when inferiority feeling first invades consciousness, this does not mean that there are no pitfalls that self-esteem may encounter in later periods. The situation is not unlike that of the child that has been subjected to a severe attack of tuberculosis. He may have gained the better of the disease so that it has become latent, but unfavorable environmental conditions can quickly make it an active menace. Inferiority feeling may be brought under control, but if there has been considerable sensitiveness or a severe environmental antagonism to the ego, the liability of a renewal of emotional inferiority is greater than when childhood has no severe testing.

[5] A. P. Noyes, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry*, p. 46.

Adolescence,[6] marriage, and the vocational career furnish opportunity for a fresh start toward an inferiority complex.

Family life is unrivaled in the opportunities it provides for the bringing of inferiority feeling. The parent may be chiefly responsible for the sense of inadequacy that becomes embedded in the growing personality of the child. There are many ways in which this can be brought about. The overambitious, the overdominant, and the harsh parent are especially dangerous. The first will encourage the child to expect too much of himself, leading to defeats that will injure his pride. The second will oppress the child's individuality and thus rob him of confidence. The third will with clumsy misapprehension turn the child in upon himself and make him feel unequal to cope with the demands of his environment. The parent of course furnishes only a part of the causal relationship, the character of the child being likewise involved. This explains how such different results can come from the same family setting. Although the familial environment cannot be an exact duplication for any two children, its essential meaning, nevertheless, its spirit of vanity, oppression, or indifference, may provide conditions that encourage inferiority feelings; but one child may lay down the foundation for a complex, while another will appear to have been strengthened by the dangers he has successfully surmounted.

The power of the family as a source of inferiority feeling must not be thought of as limited to psychic or social influences. On the contrary, there may be an independent physical liability endangering the integrity of the child, which the parent can increase or decrease by the influence he provides. It also somewhat distorts the picture of the causal situation in which the child develops to think of it as a mere parent-child relationship. It is rather a multiplicity of conditioning influences that gather about the total family. Death, desertion, or divorce may have mutilated the household so that one parent is the total family. Ordinarily, however, a larger membership is involved; and in

[6] Ira S. Wile, *The Challenge of Adolescence*, pp. 191-208.

such cases the full domestic interaction is responsible for the environmental contribution to the inferiority feeling that any particular member starts developing.

The analysis of inferiorities of domestic origin

Just as we must stress the total personality in any safe analysis of character, so we are forced to regard the family as a whole in any attempt to uncover its effects upon the growing child. It is especially important to recognize this in any analysis of inferiority feeling since the jealousy of one member of the family may have a large place in building a sense of inadequacy in another. For example, a crippled child may win so much sympathy from one or both parents as to stir up jealousy in his brothers and sisters, who in turn will make an attack upon him through his disability. A physical handicap that under favorable circumstances would not lead to a chronic feeling of inferiority becomes, if made use of by his jealous associates, a menace.

It helps in revealing the responsibility of parents for the inferiority feelings of their children to notice illustrative causal practices. One of the most common mistakes is for the parent to attempt to use the child as a means of fulfilling his own egoistic demands. He may, for example, overstress ambition in the growing child on account of his own feeling of failure. The common statement that the parent wishes the child to do better than himself is not always so wholesome and benevolent as it sounds. The underlying motive of the parent who seeks, as he says, a greater success for his child than he himself has enjoyed may be emotional exploitation. It may have no regard whatsoever for the capacity of the child, no willingness to accept the verdict of neutral observers, but rather a terrific drive to force the child forward because only so can the parent vicariously gain the satisfaction that his own career has denied.

Another and much more common parental mistake comes from a concentration of one or both parents upon out-of-the-home activities, to the emotional neglect of the child. A well-

known American scientist, confronted with a family problem due to his daughter's inferiority feeling, expressed great astonishment that his own reputation should not have safeguarded her. His fame, as a matter of fact, was the chief cause of her difficulty. The girl who could not adequately meet the demands of the environment in which she was placed by the father contrasted her failure with his success. There are parents who assume that in some magic manner the momentum of their achievements is transferred to their children and, instead of offering the fellowship that more than anything else would be protective and creative in its effect upon the growing child, hold up before him the parent's out-of-the-family career, which the child has no basis even to appreciate.

Another subtle but rare example of parental malpractice is maintaining a program of competition with the child. Again the parent uses his offspring to feed his own vanity, this time not by placing upon the child the task of providing a parasitic prestige but by inviting him to a rivalry under conditions that are certain to enhance the superiority of the parent. In cases not a few, the father's constant dwelling upon his earlier successful struggle under hard circumstances that cannot be duplicated to test the child, since the parent himself has removed them, is motivated in the peculiar vanity that leads to parent-child complications. This may take many forms, and even a mother's use of her child as a background that will emphasize and enhance her superiorities is not unknown. It would seem to be the quintessence of vanity that can thus pervert parenthood, but occasionally there is clear evidence that this is just what has happened.

Marriage also provides examples of inferiority-making practices. The most common of these is a marriage that is established upon the motive of dominance. In a recent case of marital incompatibility it was evident that so long as the wife was subservient and accepted the husband as the fountain of all virtues, compatibility was assured. The moment, however, that she called into question his judgment and his justice, as she was led

to do when she began to feel that his influence was not wholly favorable to the character-development of the child that had been born to them, her marital happiness came to an end. The complaints he brought in conference revealed, as did her protest in a subsequent interview, that at least a considerable motive of his marriage was to obtain a subject. His inferiority feeling, constantly expressed in out-of-the-home activities and attitudes, sought a refuge in a domestic dominance that soon became an emotional tyranny. The shock that came with the discovery of what was expected of her brought inferiority feeling to the wife, frustration and an aggression that eventually matched his. This of course was interpreted by the man as the supreme disloyalty.

Another example of the invasion of marriage by inferiority feeling is the selection of a mate from motives of ambition. The man who enters marriage for this purpose usually seeks a wife who has money or social position. In a recent case of this sort a man who had worked up from unfavorable conditions in his early life married a most unattractive woman who had been terribly scarred by burns, but who was heir to considerable wealth. There was nothing in their relationship ever to suggest that either had for the other any degree of affection. Instead the marriage appeared to be in the spirit of a business partnership, a relationship that became increasingly distasteful to both as the years passed. It was, however, the man who showed greater dissatisfaction. Apparently the mating, instead of becoming a contribution to his overcompensation, eventually revived earlier inferiority feeling—as he acknowledged when he committed suicide after ten years of marriage.

The woman who uses matrimony as a means of fulfilling ambition is most likely to choose a man who is rapidly advancing, shows some special talent, or is entering a profession that carries with it social distinction. Matings of this sort, with their emphasis of loveless motives, invite quick disillusionment, final disappointment, and eventually inferiority feeling.

XVII. *The Clash of Loyalties within the Family*

THE MEANING OF LOYALTY. Loyalty is something more than one of our supreme virtues. It comes from a profound craving for emotional commitment, and is inwardly determined or at least must so seem to the person who achieves it, since allegiance sufficient to be called loyalty cannot be forced upon one or driven into one's habit-life without one's awareness. Royce, who regarded loyalty as the fulfillment of the whole moral law, defined it as the "willing and practical and thoroughgoing devotion of a person to a cause."[1] In order to do justice to the meaning of loyalty, the term "cause" must be interpreted, as Royce has made clear by his illustrations, so as to include any wholehearted allegiance. One becomes identified with something external to the self so emotionally compelling that the responsibilities involved are accepted without reservation. It is the person who is loyal, the term loyalty merely describing the disposition or life-attitude of the person who has firmly tied himself to something not only greater than himself but so commanding as to set the values of life.

Loyalty can be defined so that it becomes a rare and aristocratic virtue, an achievement of strong and gifted personality. This means selecting the highest type of allegiance and missing the more significant, well-nigh universal, groping for a relationship that will bring a master interest through the alliance of inner need and outer fulfillment. It is its maturing in some exceptional career, such as that of Socrates, Darwin, or in our

[1] Jacob Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, pp. 16-17.

own time, Gandhi, that we are likely to regard as loyalty; but on lower levels, in weaker forms, and in less purity it also appears. Its highest refinements are independent of class, cultural advantages, and preachment. As a character trait, however, it is not a spontaneous disposition without history, but rather an accumulation starting in early childhood.

Children have their loyalties, but only in meaning are these akin to that which we find in the adult. Their commitments are transitory, feeble, and adulterated by the intrusions of self-interest, the absence of which is so impressive in high types of adult loyalty. It is these very flaws in the loyalty of the child that tell us that we are scrutinizing the elemental substance from which truer loyalty can be made. Childhood may become the determining period, a time of training for later commitment; but this does not mean that every child moves forward with an increasing capacity for a commanding allegiance. His desire to find someone to whom he can give himself unreservedly—for in the child his alliance must be personal—can be aborted, blocked, perverted to an antisocial expression, or extinguished.

It is difficult to distinguish those impulses and habits in a small child that are moving toward loyalty from those that are accompaniments of affection. The two processes of growth go on together, but even in the preschool child, observation can separate the child who merely loves his parents from him who also has a sense of loyalty. At a later period of growth the child's loyalty may contain an element of commitment to a cause, and usually this will be to the relationship of the family which he is beginning to formulate as something in addition to his love or loyalty for each individual member of the home.

Since the influences that chiefly determine the part which loyalty must play in any individual career operate in early childhood and as a rule originate from the family-setting, loyalty resists analysis on the adult level, but must be causally understood in its earliest simple forms. Royce, for example, in spite of his enthusiasm for the virtue, deals with it as if it had no

history and for the most part is contented to interpret its significance as an adult achievement.

It is important to turn our attention to the working of the loyalty-making processes of childhood since this forces us to recognize that we simplify a profound human problem when we think of loyalty as a possession in the singular. It is rare indeed that the growing child who is developing the ability to be loyal makes progress on a straight pathway, merely maturing his capacity for allegiance. Doubtless this does occur, but it is contrary to what appears in every frank and detailed account of childhood. These confessions in greater or less degree bring out the clashing of loyalties that were so disturbing as to be embedded in the memory, and frequently later to seem the greatest ordeal of the childhood period. The home in one way or another was involved in these experiences that so thoroughly tried the child seeking a secure alliance. This realization of conflicting loyalties, so frequently character-making in the child, is not foreign to the adult, especially in these days of complex social relationship, and potential differences in personal attitudes.

Loyalty is something more than emotion.[2] The clashing of loyalties is also something greater than the collision of impulses or of feelings. Loyalty carries emotion with it, and conflict in loyalties as it reverberates is profoundly emotional. The self faces division on its highest levels and seems hopelessly rent asunder. This is the sort of experience the child in the family undergoes when, for example, he is forced to make a decision in his allegiance because of a quarrel or divorce of his parents. Heart-rending as he would find this under any circumstances in which a surrender of affection was involved, the ordeal is made the greater because he is almost certain to have to carry this struggle in secret and to make his commitment without help, usually without even his elders realizing the depth of his suffering.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

Loyalty within the family

Family ties furnish the first natural opportunity for loyalty.[3] The family presents this opportunity to the child, who little by little identifies himself with that common linkage which becomes to him the essence of his home. He belongs to his parents, and they to him, but in addition to this all together share something which he personifies as his home. This sense of common belonging provides the first grasp he has of a cause, an out-of-the-self reality, to which he can give all he has in an unquestioned allegiance. How much he needs this experience, how desperately he fears its loss, appears in his reaction to any notion that he is not the child of his parents, but has been adopted. The quickness with which this suspicion can come into his mind on the most flimsy grounds tells us how active he is in establishing assurance that he belongs to the family, and it to him. The experience of foster parents in dealing with their adopted children proves that it is not worry over hereditary ties, but rather the doubt whether the child has been incorporated into the family unit that disturbs. It may lead to later catastrophe to hide from any child that he was adopted, but likewise it may undermine a child's character if for any reason his natural parents leave him in doubt that he belongs and that he was wanted.

In order to start propitiously a development toward mature loyalty, the child in his early years must be permitted to tie himself firmly to his home. Here is one of the places where any substitution for the family fails to bring the child the firm foundation which he needs for the building of loyalty. This deficiency alone is sufficient to condemn the orphanage as a permanent place for the care of young children. The institution may not deny them affection, but it does forbid their gaining that sense of permanent ties which starts normally the growth in personal allegiance that stabilizes and matures the emotions.

No family, however, by its mere existence furnishes the

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 220-228.

favorable opportunity for the beginnings in loyalty that the child needs. The home may be too discordant, too devoid of meaning even to offer the hungrily grasping child any basis for allegiance. Expensive governesses, tutors, camps, private schools cannot make good the loss of the emotionally exiled child. Fortunately, the individual deprived of one of his profoundest needs may discover in his later career a person or a cause to which he can wholeheartedly tie himself. But even so, he looks backward to an empty childhood and realizes, if he has insight, that he has been extraordinarily fortunate in recovering from a great emotional handicap.

A relativity in the possibilities of commitment must be recognized, since there are individual differences both in the need of gaining loyalty and the capacity to achieve it. The significance of loyalty in the individual life of the child cannot be measured by its quantity or strength, but by the part it plays in the growing-up processes, just as in the adult the meaning of loyalty comes through the individual's committing himself as thoroughly as his capacity permits.

The home experience brings out another important feature of loyalty. It must be self-directed. It cannot be produced by pressure, although the appearance of loyalty can be easily assumed, and will be if the child is subjected to force. Here again, the orphanage with its routine, its necessity of enforcing conventional behavior, however successful it may be in building efficient habits, takes from the child a condition that is necessary for the establishment of loyalty. If the outward semblance of loyalty is insisted upon, deception and a mutilated integrity are the necessary consequences. The loveless or the tyrannous family is in the same predicament. The child may make feeble efforts at being loyal, but the emptiness or the harshness of his day-by-day experiences will turn him aside from any genuine commitment of allegiance, whatever may be his overt conformity to the demands placed upon him.

Thus it is that love and freedom in early childhood beget loyalty. The experiences of the Oneida Community again illu-

minate the problems that ever face any effort to substitute for the family care of a child. It was the home-bred originators of the movement, rather than the children who had been carefully trained in preparation for their peculiar life, who were able to commit themselves most consistently to the experiment. Their final commitment to the cause, largely to the person of Noyes, reached back through a series of experiences.

The drive for loyalty

The significance of the clashing of loyalties appears only as we realize the strength of the desire of the average human being for a wholehearted commitment in allegiance. There is, of course, no drive for loyalty in the specific sense of anything approaching an instinct. Instead, the urge that leads on to the espousal of a cause or person is complex. This fact may lessen the certainty of loyalty's appearing in any individual life, but it does not lessen its force over conduct in any personality where it has developed. The closer motivation draws to unmixed primitive impulses, the more sure is its expression in conduct, which, however, does not decide its strength. For example, affection, which is similar to loyalty in its command of behavior, is likewise a complex, a welding together of impulses that are themselves a product of an individual's evolution.

One of the originating sources of loyalty is the inexorable isolation of the individual and his stubborn refusal to accept his separation. Barricaded as he is by sensory contacts, yielding only subjective experience, he nevertheless is so irresistibly social that one of the strongest of all his drives is toward union with others. He cannot escape from his own consciousness or share the experiences of another in the direct manner that he knows his own experiences, but this increases rather than lessens his eagerness for relationship. The craving is clearly related to what some have chosen to consider the instinct of gregariousness,[4] but in any case, the hunger for companionship has a more

[4] W. Trotter, *The Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War.*

complex background as it appears in human life than can be attributed to gregarious instinct alone.

The drive for loyalty is a particular type of this deeply planted longing for relationship. As one escapes isolation through love by giving one's self to another, so also by the commitment that constitutes loyalty the individual frees himself from the feeling of being by himself by tying himself thoroughly to some person or cause through the medium of his allegiance. He is carried out of himself in the same way that he forgets himself in love. His attention moves away from his isolating experiences, and he finds content through self-abandonment in some specific commitment.

This achievement of loyalty is one of the social incentives that make it possible for society to hang together. It therefore has group approval and group encouragement, even at times is so demanded of the individual by public coercion that safety may require counterfeiting what does not actually exist. Failure to conform in such cases means being ostracized. Unfortunately, however, although there is strong approval by others of the loyalty of the individual, such approval is accorded only to loyalty that shows itself to be in agreement with the attitudes and values of the existing public opinion. Loyalty per se is not acceptable. One consequence of this, sometimes coming out in tragic experience, is that an individual who is striving to free himself from isolation by allying himself with something that is greater than self-interest may, by merely being in advance of contemporary public opinion, be driven back into a greater immediate loneliness. He can, however, again escape his isolation by holding to his allegiance and lifting it by his imagination out of time; then his loyalty may be not to those who are, but to those who are to be—not to that which is, but to what is soon to be. Thus by making the future more substantial than the present he climbs to the very pinnacle of loyalty. Although he maintains his loyalty by freeing it from the present, he is likely to find himself clashing continuously with his contemporaries who view his independence as social treason.

Loyalty, unlike love, may be forced to run the gauntlet of an attacking public opinion. Here is one instance where the mechanism of social survival may operate adversely, just as does the animal instinct occasionally when it reacts in a customary way to extraordinary circumstances. Society protects itself from undermining influences because behavior that menaces it injures some of the contemporaries of the responsible individual and they protest. In practice this proves a faulty method of selection, and most often is this so when a superior loyalty clashes with current attitudes and practices. Because of this, progress is frequently made only by an assault which some individual leads against the existing social complacency.

The same mechanism works in the family, but with even greater liability of disturbance. The family, like society, welcomes, encourages, and even demands, loyalty. Its members likewise have the disposition to be loyal. Exceptions to both these statements can be found in many families, but as a rule the home seeks and receives loyalty. Since, however, it brings adults into close contact and usually with children who through change are growing in loyalty as in other achievements, clashing is not only possible but almost, if not absolutely, unescapable. The discerning family can, however, prepare for and deal with such experiences, thus removing their menace in a way that society with its mass feeling and judgment has not yet succeeded in doing.

Ancestral loyalty

No one can realize in full measure the importance of loyalty as it relates to the family unless recognition is made of the significance of ancestral loyalty. The feeling of family solidarity carries beyond the present to the extent that those who have died are still included. The degree to which they still belong, the ways that this is kept in mind, and the influences it has upon the behavior of the living vary as greatly as any social trait, ranging from what seems to be almost exclusively fear of the

dead to a reverence that becomes a supreme expression of loyalty. Such a diversity forbids any simple explanation of the origin of this feeling of the living for the dead, or any single generalization of its meaning. Nevertheless, throughout this great bulk of social behavior there runs, even though at times faintly, the notion that those who have died still belong to the family, and that this brings to the living certain obligations. These obligations may lead to an extension of social sentiment until we have highly developed ancestral loyalty.

Whatever the prevailing practices with regard to treatment of the dead, the matter is too consequential to be left freely to the family to be carried through or neglected according to the sense of responsibility or indifference of the individual household. Instead, as the folkways reveal, society takes the matter seriously and puts social pressure on those who might be inclined to forget their obligations. The quantity and the form of the pressure is influenced by the interpretation given to the dead and the vividness of the feeling that they still belong to those with whom they once associated. It follows, in the words of Westermarck, that morality takes notice not only of how men treat the living but also of their conduct toward the dead.[5] The same author tells us that the dead are supposed to have rights very similar to those that they enjoyed while living.[6] Primitive groups frequently refuse to injure trees, birds, and other forms of life because they believe that these have received the souls of former relatives. This negative avoidance of hurting those who have passed is not sufficient; in addition, positive contributions to the comfort and subsistence of the deceased must be made.[7] These obligations have taken almost every conceivable form.

This attitude of responsibility toward the dead devolving on the survivors is not limited to those existing on low levels of culture, but as it is carried forward to higher levels it shows

[5] Edward Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. 2, p. 515.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 516.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 517.

the same refinement of sentiment that appears in other cultural practices, with a great emergence of feelings of loyalty on the part of the living toward the dead. There is the idea that a person may be wronged, and through him his family, by acts that it is recognized he cannot feel. This has been recently illustrated by a newspaper report of a suit for libel by the heirs of William E. Gladstone which led to the decision that an author did not have the right to destroy the public reputation of one dead by ascribing without evidence scandalous motives. Although the attitude of many toward their ancestors is often more pride of family, fundamentally a self-vanity, than it is an acceptance of loyalty, the latter is more common and more significant.

We naturally turn to China and Japan for examples of the highest development of ancestral loyalty. In these countries it has been carried so far that it appears as the basic cultural sentiment. Any Japanese career that characteristically reflects the national culture is saturated from early childhood with incentives that lead the individual to show loyalty to his ancestors. In her vivid record of her life, Baroness Ishimoto again and again discloses the fundamental place that ancestor worship, with its spirit of loyalty, has in the feelings and practices of the Japanese people.[8] She tells us that her mother, bound by Stoic principles, hated ordinary theater-going, but made one exception, attending the drama, *Chushin-gura*, a true samurai play. She was absorbed in the moral spirit of this story of loyalty, and indifferent to its artistic qualities. For days and days after attending the theater, she would exclaim that the actor of the hero part must have been sorry to undergo such horrible disgrace.[9] The Baroness's father gave his first son a name the character for which signified filial piety because this to him was the supreme virtue of a child.

The Baroness also most impressively tells us of the ceremony, at the private school she attended, in celebration of the founding

[8] Baroness Shidzué Ishimoto, *Facing Two Ways: The Story of My Life.*
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

of the empire and the Emperor's birthday. As a part of the ritual, the much-honored General Count Maresuki Nogi closed the proceedings with the reading of the manuscript of the charter of Japanese education, and it is interesting to note the prominent place given ancestral loyalty in this recitation.

"Our Imperial Ancestors, . . . our subjects ever united in loyalty in filial piety from generation to generation, ye our subjects, be filial to your parents, . . . render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers, . . . the teaching bequeathed by our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by their descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places . . . in all reverence." [10]

The emphasis the child receives which lays the basis for family loyalty is continued through life. The Japanese each year celebrate a national festival day on which the spirits of the dead return, and there is family obligation to attend funerals and recurring commemorative services which reinforce the early teaching.

As soon as she was married the Baroness found herself obligated to visit the homes of her relatives when she learned of the death of any members. Then later she had to attend "through night service" and later still the funeral. Then came the memorial services on the tenth, twentieth, thirtieth, fortieth, fiftieth, and hundredth day in the Shinto ritual; in addition to the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth, thirty-fifth, forty-ninth, and hundredth day service in the Buddhist ritual. Then followed the anniversaries—the first, the third, the fifth or the seventh year to the tenth or the thirteenth, seventeenth or twentieth to the fiftieth and one hundredth year service, according to the religion of the family.[11] Since attendance on all of these was a solemn obligation, it is apparent how thoroughly social convention was organized to maintain in the living the feeling of ancestral loyalty.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72. By permission of Farrar & Rinehart, publishers.
[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 138-139.

However stabilizing ancestral loyalty is, it becomes an anchorage, a major means of holding to the traditions. Change may take place elsewhere, as illustrated by the rapid industrial advance of Japan, but the family resists change within itself, protected as it is. To move the family forward becomes an impiety, treason against loyalty, as comes out so clearly in the domestic tragedy of Baroness Ishimoto herself. The whole family system which dominates the private life is held together by a spirit of loyalty that reaches its climax in a reverence that looks backward to the dead and thereby exploits the living. The incompatibility between out-of-the-family change and the rigid continuity within the family becomes obvious to a few forward-looking individuals, who are forced to retreat, to conceal their protest, or to enter a hopeless struggle against the prevailing public opinion. Nevertheless, these individual tragedies foreshadow a clashing that time will make more obvious and more common. The incongruity of a civilization moving forward and looking backward prophesies a readjustment that must come either gradually or suddenly, bringing into safer proportion ancestral loyalty. Turkey has recently demonstrated how rapidly social change can come about, once there is any serious severance of traditional ties.

The excesses of ancestral loyalty, which may be found in individual careers in this country in spite of the much more common indifference, show how inherent such loyalty is in the family system, and how easily it can be developed to a degree that hampers adjustment to the existing realities.

The ambivalent basis of clashing

In spite of the naturalness with which family affection ordinarily develops and the strength it commonly assumes, it does not escape opposition from contrary reactions. This ambivalency is covered up by conventional sentiments, and the family misinterpreted as a relationship in which love assumes its supremacy without contest. Such a description of the family

is not only untrue to the facts, but conceals one of its most significant features. Hate follows love as a shadow; it can also move in front and take precedence.

The egoistic values that each individual seeks from familial fellowship make it difficult for him to accept impersonally experiences that oppress or deny his desires and purposes, and his feelings of protest contain potential hate. The reason why this so frequently is hidden is that its acknowledgment seems to be a criticism of a particular family and, if generalized, of the family as an institution; and also because the enmity is as a rule so mild and transitory. This concealment, instead of protecting the family, hides the strength of the institution and the value of its functioning. Likewise, the neglect of the hate aspects of family experience, because they are infrequent and weak in well-established homes, prevents insight as to how the family maintains integrity, and beclouds any analysis of unsuccessful homes and marriages.

Hate enters the family with love because the two are inseparable, as conjoined as night and day, good and evil, or heat and cold. Love deserves its distinction not because it is acquired without effort but because it is an achievement through struggle. We can accept it as genuine only when it has reached the highest form, so thoroughly refined as to seem devoid of even the possibilities of hate, but this is to deny its history and to recognize it only when, like gold, it has been purified and freed from the matrix of necessary maturing clashing. Thus to define love as it is cradled, unfolded, and disentangled within the family is to rob it of its meaning. Of course, there are great differences in persons as to the denseness of the shadow of hate that at least in very early life follows after love, but even in much-favored children, there is an ambivalence that needs to be recognized because it is indispensable to growth.

Whatever may be the final valuation of the concept of ambivalence in childhood for therapeutic analysis of personality conflict, this contribution of psychoanalysis provides an indis-

pensable insight for the student of familial experience.[12] It furnishes an illuminating entrance for the investigator of family interactions. It is particularly important for the understanding of the clashing of loyalties within the family. Whether it is interpreted in accord with the assumptions of any one of the various psychoanalytic schools, or whether it is detached and used independently, it brings into perspective the important fact that even love as expressed within the family is not simple and uncontested, but complex and accumulative.

There is a vast difference between the clashing of love and hate and the collision of loyalties. The first is a conflict of opposites, the second a division in a sentiment so akin to love as to seem to be its natural product. Emotional maturity can free love from its earlier rival, hate, but the test of love as it expresses itself in personal loyalty is much more trying; and the growth of personality, instead of throwing out the possibility of inward clashing, may bring what was once only latent or potential into a moral collision. As unity of loyalty separates into two antagonistic values, the smooth ongoing of high emotions comes to an end toward maturity. What has been accepted without question comes under attack and may be repudiated. A single loyalty is replaced by two or more, and circumstances require a choice that may seem a repudiation of former love, even leading to its replacement by hate.

The experience may be forced upon the child in his premature years. It may come through the self-awakening of adolescence. It may await the greater maturity that follows one's leaving home and becoming receptive to new influences. It may emerge after years of marriage when the covering of self-deception has worn away and the individual has to re-survey his motivations and expectations. Whenever its appearance is made it is unexpected, and until settlement is reached the individual in trouble feels himself without the securities and certainties upon which his idealism and moral assurance depend.

[12] J. C. Flügel, *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Family*.

Individualism and clashing

The family, like all other social organizations, is less likely to have clashing among its members when there is a strong central authority, and this is most apt to accompany father domination. Even when the head of the family rules, disputes arise, but, as Zimmerman points out, these are the concern of the family and are seldom taken outside.[13] The rural family must accept responsibility also for the clashing of any of its members with outsiders. Thus, standing in contrast with families in the city where the responsibility of individuals is more likely to be emphasized, this concentration of authority in rural families that are able largely to escape the backwash of modern urban culture is favored by the co-operative economic functions that the family members maintain. Their isolation, which makes possible their familial partnership, means that their escape from individualism is both costly and precarious. The attack upon their integrity comes from modern life itself, but nevertheless they bear testimony by their strength and solidarity that much of the clashing to be found in families exposed to modern culture is the result of an exaggeration of individualism which lessens the unity of the family and weakens it as a social institution.

The clashing of the individual members of a family is in large measure influenced by the amount of self-expression each expects and receives. The family that individualizes its members and permits each to have the freedom that is prerequisite to the development of personality provides an interaction that stands in contrast with the family system of parental domination. This does not mean merely that in the second type of family, disputes and antagonisms are repressed, but even more that they do not get under way because the stimulating opportunity is lacking. However, if any member of the family has in some way acquired the disposition for a freer type of self-expression than the dominated family can tolerate, clashing is inevitable and likely to take violent form. Frequently solidarity is main-

[13] C. C. Zimmerman and M. E. Frampton, *The Family and Society*, p. 283.

tained by what is in intent and consequences either forcing the rebellious person to break away from the family or driving him against his will into exile.

Internally the isolated family's self-sufficiency has to maintain its defenses against the influences of modern life in the same way that its economy must protect itself from the more usual means of livelihood in modern society. It follows that if such a self-contained form of family life discourages clashing among its members, it does this by laying itself open to a cultural assault, so that sooner or later, as its separation weakens, it is open to attack, as an institution, by a dominant and alien cultural environment. The good fortune of members of such a family, so far as avoiding individualistic clashing is concerned, is therefore a respite that passes as soon as they are thrown into the cultural current of modern life. This may not happen to the individual family but only to some of its members who leave the home and are found painfully ill-prepared to meet the testing of the new environment.

The Polish Peasant in Europe and America permits us to look in upon the sufferings of many men and women who in addition to the adjustments required in passage from the Old World to the New also had to reconstruct a life-system developed within what is termed familial solidarity,[14] in order to adapt to a culture more in accord with individualistic self-expression. One example, especially illuminating, is the transition that had to be made by one who had been accustomed to maintaining self-support through family co-operation but who found that his livelihood depended upon working for others. He had no preparation for the radical change that had to be made, and to earn his living he was forced to make a profound revolution in his psychology.[15]

There is a great difference that must always be kept in mind between the clashing of individuals in the family and the clash of family loyalty, but just as individualism encourages the one,

[14] W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, vol. 1, p. 89.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 508.

so it does the other. In the thoroughly dominated family, the occasions that create the clashing of loyalties are few. The authority is so well established that any tendency toward division of loyalty is aborted. The responsibility for direction belongs to the head of the family, and he personifies the unity of the family so that obedience becomes itself both a test and the expression of loyalty. If through unusual circumstances a collision between loyalties does occur, it is apt to be localized within the experience of the head himself, a liability that goes with his leadership.

In the family where individualism is marked, in addition to the differences between individual members of the family there arises more frequently than in the other type of family a colliding of loyalties. Individualistic self-development opens the frontier of the personality to diverse influences, and thus there may come about a challenging of a loyalty that has long held sway or at least has not been seriously questioned. The clashing of persons may itself become to some members of the family a clashing of loyalties. The father and mother, for example, may appeal their case to the children and demand support, not as participants in a mere personal quarrel, but on the grounds of family loyalty. It is amazing to see, in cases of domestic incompatibility as they become known to the family counselor, how far a parent will go in clothing incompatibility as a moral issue, and then attempt by using it as a test of loyalty to win allies. This, however, is only one type of the clashing of loyalties stimulated by individualism. Another very common type, as any counselor of youth soon discovers, comes from the parents' establishing the loyalties that the child must follow, then sending the latter to a university where through wider cultural contact he begins to doubt an old loyalty and assumes a new, only to meet with the demand of the parents that he surrender his convictions in the name of affection. This experience came to many young people at the time when the Darwinian theory of evolution first began to percolate into the instruction of American colleges. An episode of this sort was dramatically portrayed by

James Lane Allen in his novel, *The Reign of Law.* A young fellow from a very conservative home where the thought of the Darwinian hypothesis was anathema became, through his reading, interested in, and finally a convert to, the theory of evolution, and because of his loyalty to his new belief was expelled from the conservative college he attended. He returned home, expecting the criticism of his parents, but he was not prepared for his father's charging him with disloyalty and casting him out. The author shows, highly magnified, the tragedy of clashing loyalties that young people still undergo when the higher education that their parents have made possible disturbs a conviction with its accompanying loyalty that the home has tried to build into the life of the growing personality from early childhood. Some escape the clashing by inner division and self-deceit, some avoid it by a willful process of intellectual repression, some turn from it by ignoring the collision, and others prevent the disturbance of their parents by fictitious acquiescence, although this may be a mere postponement leading later to a clashing which has in addition feelings of guilt. The great majority of young people, however, find themselves under such circumstances thrown into violent confusion. The stabilizing effect of a dominant loyalty disappears, and their idealism beckons them in opposite directions. Their north star, which has given them moral direction, hides behind a cloud, and they struggle to find the course recently so clear. It is the rare family that prepares them for the possibility of this ordeal, showing them patience in their struggle, and that respects their integrity by a policy of noninterference. Deficient as families are apt to be in their understanding of the meaning of such an occurrence, they are, so far as they have encouraged individualism, responsible.

Childhood loyalties and their clashing

The determining experiences that provide the basis for adult loyalties have to be traced backward into childhood. The con-

trast, however, between the fullness of one and the meagerness of the other might give the impression that there is no relation between them. It is of course useless to attempt to find in children anything like a self-conscious, mature commitment to a cause, something unachieved by many adults. Nevertheless, there is clear evidence in the emotions of children that they can take on in the simple way of feeling what is in fact an elementary allegiance; and if given reasonable opportunity, this they do. The experience has to be at first a sense of alliance to some person, and can come only when the child who feels that he is tied to another believes that his love is returned and his belonging recognized. Through this second part of the two-way relationship the child has the opportunity to start his development in the feeling of allegiance, which is his reaction to the fact of his belonging. He is not satisfied merely to take from the other, although this will be his predominating experience; he also wants to give to the relationship and must believe that what he offers has value. Thus loyalty develops in some degree as gratitude for his emotional security, but rather more as a testimony of the certainty of the mutual possession. Even in his emotional needs the child cannot come to his parents as a beggar, since merely to receive would lessen his assurance. It is as if he knew that any one-way giving was a precarious relation, and that therefore he needed to strengthen it by feeling that his own contribution guaranteed the value and the persistency of that coming from the other.

Any such analysis means reading into the experience what is not self-conscious to the child. It is better to be content with saying that the child gives what he wishes to receive—a thoroughgoing commitment—and that at first it is an expression of feeling rather than any result of thinking. At least if there be thought-content, it will be with reference to the specific situation and only by intimation suggestive of any later, more mature allegiance. Nevertheless, potentially present in the interaction is the possibility of the child's gathering the substance of both feeling and thought that later becomes a self-conscious loyalty.

This new attitude can be distinguished from the earlier preceding experience only by the fact that now there begins to be a standard of self-expectation, an elemental code of honor, and a degree of self-importance. The commitment is becoming self-conscious enough to provide the start of what needs only time to become well-rooted loyalty.

This process of growth gets its start in an intimacy with some person whom the child can trust, and ordinarily this means that the parents first receive tokens of the embryonic loyalty. The child's sense of belonging leads to impulsive, periodic, and highly emotional demonstrations of allegiance, which quickly acquire in the consciousness of the child the value already discussed that results from giving as well as taking from the parent. Fortunately, also, these faint beginnings, interpreted as manifestations of the child's love, are welcomed and responded to by the parents.

Since the child has two parents, his loyalty naturally moves toward both. However, this unity can be easily broken, and even in the most happy of homes the child is likely at times to fix his loyalty upon one parent to the exclusion of the other. Often this is because of misunderstanding on his part. He assumes differences, even conflicts, when they do not exist. Frequently also the child is led by his partisanship, which may be a reflex of jealousy, to turn his loyalty away from one parent to the other. He may have from the beginning a severed loyalty, and this may be brought about by a multitude of conditions, the most common being the determination of one parent to usurp the child and prevent his becoming attached to the other.

The meaning of the experience can also vary. It may have nothing but an ephemeral significance, being but a fleeting episode that may be best interpreted as the child's mood for the moment. More often, it is a substantial but changing feeling. The mere routine of family life gives the mother at the first the superior position. This she may continue to maintain, or there may be a sharp reversal, or instead a back-and-forth preference as the loyalty swings from one parent to the other.

So long as it includes both parents, the superiority of the mother or the father does not bring any clashing that disturbs the child. The greater commitment becomes a preference rather than an antagonism, and the child still feels the unity of loyalty that is indispensable to his peace of mind. He may even go so far as more or less playfully to attempt to stir up the competition of his parents for his commitment, which he assumes they take as seriously as he does himself. All these happenings are consistent with his movement toward a firmly fixed disposition for loyalty. His accumulation develops gradually, favored by the sense of security. He enjoys the constancy in the giving and taking of affection which he requires to plant firmly his increasing capacity for loyalty.

A natural negativism normally appears in the child after the third or fourth year that can be wrongly interpreted by the parent and so handled as to create a genuine loss of the child's loyalty, even bringing about a clashing with the parent that in time becomes to the child a conflict between his self-assertion and what is presented to him as a demonstration of affection and loyalty. The child discovers that he has a will of his own and begins to enjoy its use.[16] This may bring him into conflict with his elders, but if dealt with in understanding and patience, it does not involve any fundamental change in their personal relationship. If, however, the matter is mismanaged and treated with harshness, genuine enmity and the beginning of a divorcement may be the result. It will be, of course, not a full-fledged revolt, a conscious repudiation, but merely a bad start which can be carried by time to a cleavage that forces on the child either a hazardous repression or some degree of rebellion which weakens, if it does not begin to destroy, his growth toward loyalty.

The most serious ordeal that can be thrust upon the child is the separation of parents that he has grown to believe secure in their love for each other. As soon as the break becomes known to him and begins to register in self-consciousness, he

[16] Leo Kanner, *Child Psychiatry*, p. 369.

faces the severest dilemma that can be put before him. His allegiance must now be self-consciously directed. Even if there be no contest between the parents in the effort to win him to a superior relationship and no open effort to make him the partisan of one or the other, it is difficult to avoid doing what leads to this, and usually they succeed only in rationalizing their behavior so as to keep from consciousness the real purposes of their strategy. The child himself can hardly abstain from raising the issue, since in the very effort to explain to himself what has occurred he is driven to an emotional judgment as to who is more to blame, or at least on whose side he stands, and this preference forbids the simple, consistent feelings of loyalty that were being stimulated by his previous relationship to each parent.

This reaction makes divorce always a hazard for the child, and, in more cases than adults realize, a catastrophe. However necessary divorce may be as a solution of the difficulty of the parents, it brings to the child, if he is old enough to have any realization of what it means, a finality that gives him no choice but to reshape the feelings of loyalty that he has had toward the parents. However partisan he becomes in his final commitment to one as compared with the other, there has been a shock that interferes with the natural growth of the sense of loyalty. It may seem at first as if the child's feeling for the favored parent was even stronger than anything he had experienced before the breaking up of his family. This intensity is in part the reaction of panic, and in most instances is likely to show that childhood has not yielded the foundation for mature loyalty that the wholesome personality needs in life.

Adolescent clashing of loyalties

Adolescence is inherently liable to a clashing of loyalties because it demands a new status within the family for the individual passing out of childhood, and the parental policy may be one which so obstructs this readjustment that the child battles

with his parent. If so, he soon finds that he is hampered in his struggle unless he reshapes the feeling of loyalty that has been the greatest power that the parent has had over him. He feels differently toward the parent and has to interpret him in a new way. The spirit of loyalty that had been automatic, but in which he took pride, becomes a fetter to hold him in subserviency. He has to recast even the past in order to reconstruct his family relationship, and in the process may react against the injustice, the tyranny, and even the dislike which he believes the parent with whom he struggles has shown toward him.

The vigor and concentration of the adolescent, his self-absorption and yet his shortsightedness and lack of experience create a situation difficult under any circumstances for the parent who is seeking to give the child a safe entrance into the more responsible life of adulthood. Good motives as well as selfish desires may lead the parent to take a position of control and dominance that the child cannot tolerate. The parent may fortify himself by appeal to the child's affection. He may insist that any divergence from his commands is a disloyalty, and on account of the unsoundness of this position, plus the parent's unskillfulness and failure in sympathy and insight, the child may find himself such a victim of conflict, as his affection and self-determination clash, that he is left, whatever the outcome of the struggle, incapable of the wholehearted allegiance to the family ties that he had been developing during childhood. In such a collision it is not infrequent for the strength which the child puts forth to win what he considers his rights to gather such a momentum that it not only accomplishes its purpose but in so doing sweeps away much of the former sympathy between parent and child, so that never afterward on either side can there be the feeling of loyalty that previously had seemed so well secured.

There is one clashing of loyalties common in the period of adolescence for which the parents are nearly always to blame. Adolescence is a stage of body development and one in which for the first time, due to changes in the organism, sex in the

adult sense becomes prominent. Since every adult has to go through this development and learn from personal experience not only how difficult it is but how artificial its trials usually are, it would seem as if parents would be eager to give the pre-adolescent preparation for the experience and would have sympathy and understanding when it arrives. On the contrary, parents have been and in a great majority still are the chief barrier to adolescent heterosexual development. Instead of a realistic acceptance of the fact that the child as a normal human being is bound to acquire sex impulses, and that health, happiness, domestic security, and even the ongoing of society demand that these impulses be matured and directed but not contaminated with feelings of self-blame, shame, and guilt, the home attempts to maintain a program of concealment, deception, and if possible repression. The school, the church, and society in general accept the cue given by the parent until the very term "sex," a primary social concept, becomes a verbal contraband, and even specialists in social hygiene can seriously discuss whether or not the word because of its mischievous connotations had not better be abandoned in their program.

The hazards and the sufferings that go along with such a program would be lessened if it were possible to keep the adolescent sexually quiescent, but the strength of the endowment as it becomes a body-mind complex makes this policy futile. Retardation is possible; concealment, which the parent will catalogue as innocence rather than ignorance, more often can be accomplished. The most common result, however, is that idealization which, although it borrows energy from sex impulse, repudiates any connection with such a source.[17] The penalty, great in proportion to the success of the program, is not only an artificial separation of two fundamental life-motivations that need to be held together, but a clashing which, although originating in adolescence, may be more destructive of personal integrity and a greater impediment to adjustment in a later period.

[17] Floyd Dell, *Love in the Machine Age*, p. 311.

Some progress has been made in convincing individual parents of the need of a more honest and intelligent policy owing to the pressure of prevailing social conditions and most especially the self-determination of many modern youths. The program of the home, the school, the college, and the church, however, for the most part remains what is no less than a conspiracy against the development of an ethical realism and thereby the attainment of a consistent idealism. A fictitious romanticism may for the moment hide, or at least keep out of consciousness, the clashing of two fundamental loyalties, but this is a mere postponement of an eventual collision that makes more difficult the choosing of a mate. A cleavage that was hazardous in adolescence may be tragic after marriage. To interpret this mistraining as something that merely victimizes the young woman is to miss a part of its significance. The male also encounters the clashing, and if his impulses get franker recognition through less social coercion, he may nevertheless experience clashing of loyalties and, reacting to his practices, project upon woman an idealism or upon himself an asceticism, as in the case of Tolstoy, that will make marriage an endless conflict for himself and a possible moral and emotional turmoil for his wife.

Sigmund Freud in *A Young Girl's Diary* has rescued for us as revealing a record of this artificial clashing of loyalties in adolescence as ever has been printed. He rightly says that never before has anything been written that so clearly enables us to see into the soul of a young girl as, subjected to our social conventions, she passes through the years of puberal development.[18] Here she recorded for her own eye alone the intense but natural curiosity, her inability to gain any satisfactory knowledge, the terrific but groundless fears that somehow she had been guilty of an unspeakable thing, a belief that her searchings were sinful and therefore disloyal to the affection that she felt for her parents, finally coming to the climax as she convinces herself that what she knew as "segsual" intimacies of her father and mother became

[18] Sigmund Freud (Eden and Cedar Paul, tr.), *A Young Girl's Diary*, p. 7.

the cause of the latter's death,[19] along with the secret curiosity that she and her sister had so wickedly carried on.

Parental clashing of loyalties

The clashing of loyalties in the child and in the adolescent are so much more common and spectacular than similar experiences in the parent that the significance of the last is likely to be overlooked. There are three types of collision that invade the serenity and routine of parenthood, creating an inward division that may be reflected back to the children. The first takes many forms, but is an attempt to maintain and transmit an original idealism while at the same time recognizing the disappointments and disillusionments that life has brought. In many parents the two seem to be fundamentally incompatible, and although the mood of the moment may elevate one above the other, a decision of allegiance appears inevitable. Shall the growing child be given the unquestioned idealism which still to the parent carries a feeling of something that ought to be, or shall the child be given a realistic attitude which the parent has learned through suffering to be more in accord with the demands of life? Each interpretation invites the commitment of an unswerving loyalty. The choice seems to be the parent's, but the consequence must be the child's. Such a contest brings to the conscientious parent realizing its importance a clashing of two motivations of conduct, each of which seems both neccessary and desirable. An attempt to compromise means adulterating the loyalty decided on by bringing in its opposite.

Another clashing which often tries the souls of sensitive, thoughtful parents comes from the necessity of restraint. Affection seems at first a thoroughly trustworthy commitment, but experience and now science reveal that love from the parent to the child requires discipline. In an extreme case, the parent may be struggling to achieve the Spartan program put forth by some critic of the family reacting emotionally to the difficul-

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

ties of his own growing up. Her authority, for the problem is more commonly the mother's, may issue from the laboratory,[20] leaving her to feel an "ought" that is repugnant to every impulse of parenthood. Whatever the choice of program, it is likely to be arrived at through clashing and to be invaded constantly by opposite inclinations. This exaggeration of the hazards of parent-child relationships, with the selection of an extravagant love as an example of the undermining of the growing child's character, has thrown many fathers and mothers into confusion as they have felt the clashing of two antagonistic loyalties.

These extreme cases illustrate how easily in the career of any parent may come the same sort of clashing when it seems that a choice has to be made between giving the child the love that both parent and child crave and encouraging in him the independence and self-sufficiency that his welfare also demands. This inner struggle must have been rather frequent and long continued in the Oneida Community. Noyes tells us of his being sentenced, because it was evident that he had become "sticky to his mother," to an exile of another week of separation. Rightly he comments that the turbulence was his, but the greater tragedy his mother's.[21]

In recent years there has come another type of clashing which becomes a fearful ordeal to any parent forced to face the problem. Any totalitarian society, whether organized on a national or group basis, brings tyranny and cruelty which under ordinary circumstances the parent would combat at every opportunity in the presence of his children. Instead the family's economic or physical security may demand an apparent acquiescence on his part lest his getting into trouble bring grave danger to them. As a parent realizing the emotional consequences of hate and social deception, he feels himself torn between two loyalties. If he were by himself, his choice would be easier. Even enthusiastic support of practices fundamentally abhorrent to him may be necessary unless he wishes to jeopardize his home. He may try

[20] J. B. Watson, *Psychological Care of the Infant and Child.*
[21] Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House*, p. 67.

to compromise and stand for one thing inside the home and another outside, but this is also a hazardous decision and one that may cost him the wholehearted loyalty of his child.

This experience reveals how unsafe the domestic institution is in an environment of social aggression and suppression. It is true that the threshold of the home is the most substantial barrier against totalitarian tyranny, but this does not save the family from moments when the parents feel that they have the life of their children in their hands as they are driven by external circumstances in two different directions. The totalitarian state has the same suspicion, even fear, of the home that it has of the church. There is, however, a greater difficulty in getting at the former because of its isolation and privacy. This leads to policies that have their root in the determination to force the subserviency of parents. The harshness and the underground attacks easily bring parents, because they are fathers and mothers, to such a state of panic that they seek to drown out any clashing of loyalty to the safety of the home and loyalty to former convictions by exaggeration of commitment to the program dictated by prudence.

Matrimonial clashing of loyalties

Marriage attempts an emotional relationship like no other. This does not mean that there is some standard experience that can be regarded as the norm. In that sense, matrimony has no common content. The peculiarity that sets it off from all other emotional experiences is the fact that it is a special type of intimate fellowship between a man and a woman. Since the two concerned are individuals unique in their composition as personalities, their union is likewise unique, something that cannot be compared with the life together of any other couple. This uniqueness and separation from all other associations is the one common element which each matrimonial venture possesses. Matrimonial loyalties, as they find concrete expression, are also individual in their meaning, a product of the history of each

member of the alliance and also of their interactions as husband and wife.

The loyalties that flourish within marriage are, because of their origin, exclusive in their significance. They have meaning to the man and the woman, and a meaning that comes from the uniqueness of their relationship. The consequence is that the marriage loyalties may clash in the consciousness of either or both members in the association with some other loyalty that stands outside the intimacy. This means more than, or at least something different from, the clashing of other loyalties in extramatrimonial relationships. The uniqueness of marriage, the something that marks it off from other male-female intimacies, is its essential loyalty. The form this takes shows great cultural variation—for example, as it takes shape among people who have a pluralistic system of mating and those who have a strict monogamic system. Independent of the form of marriage, there is a loyalty that constitutes the essence of the individual mating, a composite to which the career and personalities of each, as well as the cultural background, contribute. The consequence of this is that the clashing of marriage loyalties is something more than a tremendous emotional collision. It is an attack on the marriage itself. The husband or wife who struggles for a solution or escape from the ordeal becomes conscious that the integrity of the relationship is at stake.

There is, of course, a variation in the intensity of matrimonial loyalty as well as in its content, but not until an individual has been put to the test does it appear how profound is his reaction to any jeopardizing of the kind of loyalty that he has come to accept as belonging to his marriage. The clashing of loyalties is something other than the feeling of jealousy, although the two may go hand in hand.

In late courtship and early marriage opportunity frequently arises for a clashing of loyalties that is not only painful to the person involved but also appears as an uncompromising collision that seems likely to destroy happiness, and that in fact frequently does just this. It takes a variety of forms, but fundamentally

it is a clash between loyalty to one's truthfulness, to one's sincerity, and to the expectations of the marriage partner. Since this second loyalty has been assumed by the person in trouble to be the guarantee of his own love, the common result of such a clashing is an overwhelming impulse to confess, for only so can he feel that he is maintaining his integrity as a lover. He is driven into the dilemma of attempting to prove his sincerity by disclosing whatever seems to him to be contrary and false to his relationship. The time element disappears as the past is brought into the present. If he follows the prudential counsel of others, he will hide whatever he interprets as disloyal to his present affection, but only with difficulty can he rid himself of the feeling that by this act of concealment he has become once more disloyal.

The same experience comes later in marriage, modified merely by the fact that there is now a large accumulation mutually possessed that has resulted from years of living together. Now the clashing of loyalties must take a somewhat different form. One loyalty incentive will be the attempt to save the other from pain. This may range from hiding some episode of extramarital passion, to the mere realization that the other no longer has the attraction or possesses the affection that was true at the beginning of marriage. The opposing loyalty will be again the demand for frankness. This may be reinforced by the association which the husband and wife have maintained. They may be under oath to one another to be considerably honest. When put to test, however, the one who finds these two opposing allegiances in conflict hesitates to make the necessary decision. He feels the loyalty he owes to the person who has meant much to him in the past, who may be indispensable to his comfort in the present, who has brought him his children, and stood by him in moments of great need. Any infringement of this loyalty seems cruel and unjust. It also demands a recognition of matrimonial failure that he does not wish to face, much less to share with anyone else. On the other hand, a withholding of genuine feeling or judgment not only means being unfrank but

at once forces him to act a part and become, as it seems to him, basically disloyal to the meaning of marriage. Sensitive individuals are of course most likely to find themselves in the throes of such matrimonial clashing. They also are apt to suffer from their dilemma whatever their solution. This type of clashing provides a fertile field for the serious novelist, poet, and playwright, but this matrimonial hazard is too upsetting to the complacent and the romantic ever to be a source of popular literature.

The ordinary clashing of husband and wife must not be confused with the clashing of loyalties in marriage. One is merely an exaggeration of the differences that are bound to occur in any continuous interaction of free, independent persons. The second is a break in the continuity of allegiance that constitutes the soul of matrimonial fellowship. Except when this clashing precedes or comes at the beginning of marriage before there has been any thoroughgoing commitment to a dominant domestic attitude, it is warning that the marriage may fail and bring as a penalty the clashing which forces upon those in trouble a realization of the emptiness of the fellowship. If domestic loyalties were an alien idealism, a mere product of social coercion, the break in allegiance would not cause the mortification and despair characteristic of such inward division. Although in fact loyalties in the form they take are incentives originating in the social environment, they have become so accepted as personal commitments that any compulsion they have seems self-given.

When any major interest of marriage or the family becomes through social conditions unstable, inconsistencies of sentiment and discord of loyalties are encouraged. At present, wherever modern urban civilization has become dominant, there is a considerable disturbance in the sex code. This is perhaps most noticeable at present in the United States. Although society has always found difficulty in maintaining the monogamic standard, it is now having, for various reasons, more than its usual trouble. The greater equality of women with men, the

widespread knowledge of birth control, the emphasis upon individualism, extravertive values, and a pleasure economy have, especially in the American middle class and among young people, encouraged unconventional practices.[22] Their nonconformity can be both exaggerated and minimized, since it cannot be accurately measured. It is obvious, however, that the standards of sex behavior before and during marriage, especially in the case of women, are not so firmly established as formerly.[23]

This situation has a direct effect upon both courtship and marriage adjustment. One result is an individual confusion, an inconsistency of attitude, that frequently develops into an emotional dualism. Time adds its influence, since not only are the individual departures from the code largely entered upon in late adolescence before there has been any considerable experience, but also because of this there is every opportunity for a change of attitude, a repudiation of earlier convictions, or at least of earlier persuasions. Then there may result clashing when strong affection appears and stands in contrast to former passion alliances; then inner pressure for confession as a token of a new and deeper loyalty is more likely to occur. Release from the past is sought through renunciation and confessions, while, on the other hand, such a procedure is felt to be not only dangerous to the fellowship, but also misleading because of the exaggerated effect it may have upon the new and differently rooted allegiance.

The greater frankness between young people also brings new demands. The clashing of loyalties may be influenced by the fact that one is supposed to be more revealing than was true when the code had as one of its elements a conspiracy of silence in regard to anything sexual. For example, an attack of gonorrhea gains a new significance when it enters into the question as to what frankness loyalty demands. Loss of virginity also may take on a new significance. Never absent is the question

[22] Oliver M. Butterfield, *Love Problems of Adolescence*, pp. 135-142.

[23] Hornell and Ella B. Hart, *Personality in the Family*, chap. IV; L. B. Bromley and F. H. Britten, *Youth and Sex*, chap. II.

of what effect frankness along certain lines may have upon the final reaction of the other in loyalty. Unfortunately, this is something that can never be guaranteed by promises or affirmations, because future feeling is always in the lap of time. One can stand by one's assertions as an obligation, but this is insignificant in its effect since the feeling of loyalty is something that cannot be manipulated by self-pressure but is decided by the basic emotions of the total personality.

The illusiveness of parenthood

The full meaning of the clashing of loyalties within the family cannot be had unless there is recognition of the illusive aspects of parenthood. It is not difficult for the clinic specialist to point out mistakes on the part of parents and to charge them with the causing of personality defects in the child. A mere cataloguing of the failures of parenthood, however, gives the student little insight as he seeks an understanding of the clashing of loyalties within the family. It is necessary also to take into account an inherent liability of parenthood, its illusiveness.

The father and mother normally, as they deal with the child, have their thought turned toward his future. In fact, this anticipation breaks up into near and distant futures. Parental concern cannot be exhausted in taking care of the child's immediate needs. A parent is impelled to be more than a nurse. Imagination and affection unite to give the parent incentives that make him feel for the moment that he is the custodian of the child's career for years in advance. Were this not true, parenthood would function imperfectly, for it is always in part anticipatory. As the parent's thinking jumps ahead and constructs visions of the child's future, it does not easily in these anticipations take into account the changes in personal relationship this ongoing of the child must bring. Recognition of this may be accepted easily as an intellectual fact, but emotionally the parent is most apt to project the present status of parent and child even though this is inconsistent with the development that the child is expected to make.

In this respect the family is a microcosm leading human nature forward by motives that in the form they take are deceptive but that in their purposes are indispensable to the functioning of parenthood. The child as his maturity proceeds moves away from the parent's ideal, which in its emotional content assumes growth without separation. Thus the wholesome development of the child requires of the parent from time to time reconstruction of his expectations for his offspring, and this may become a clashing of loyalty to the latter's future against what appears as loyalty to the values of the existing parent-child relationship.

This departing of the child from the relationship which the parent again and again idealizes is a constant process, becoming impressive at various stages when change makes the parent and child conscious of their differences. It is normally most pronounced as the mating impulse matures and marriage follows. When economic co-operation holds the family together there may be less clashing, the sons remaining with their parents, as has been true in China. Then the daughters at wifehood are the ones who are detached from their previous family fellowship. The modern parent as a rule, with differing degrees of emotional intensity, hopes for greater achievement by the child at every stage of the latter's career, while at the same time picturing to himself the continuing of the present relationship or even the return of earlier experiences. Past, present, and future mingle and give the parent motivation as he seeks to direct the growth of the child. Thus the stage is set for the supreme ordeal of parenthood, that illusiveness which, as is true of life itself, drives human nature toward goals that are always seemingly near but never attainable.

XVIII. *The Environmental Sensitiveness of the Family*

THE FAMILY AND ITS ENVIRONMENT. In the preceding chapters the functioning of the family has been discussed from various aspects with recognition always that, although the family can, for its interpretation, be set off from the environment, it is never an independent organization. The emphasis, however, has been upon the contribution it makes to group life and the meaning it has for the individual. Its environmental contact has been assumed, and the significance of this contact has appeared in the analyses of the family both as a social institution and as an arena within which its members have carried on their interactions.

There is need, however, to give more attention to the effect of the environment upon the family itself. The human anchorage of the family is so firm as it reaches down into biologic endowments that there is risk of exaggerating its separation from its environment. This does not mean that any interpretation is apt ever to go so far as to lift it out of its social contacts and deny its interrelations with other social institutions and with the general group life, but rather that, as in the case of the church, the school, and especially law, attention concentrates on its working within itself in a way that fails to do justice to the reciprocity between it and its total environment. Granting that there is a considerable leakage in the process of adaptation, the mere perpetuity of the human race gives testimony that the family has rarely so gotten out of hand in its survival contributions as to destroy its social functioning. Nevertheless, its social status, its out-givings and in-takings, cannot be described ade-

quately unless the family is looked at with a reverse of emphasis, from the viewpoint of the environment. This approach lays bare the sensitiveness of domesticity to social conditions, and in turn, taken by itself, gives the impression that the family is a clustering of interests responding to external pressure.

The living family, in contrast to concepts that define opposite extremes, is both apart from the environment and related to it. As an institution it has its own inward integrity, but this never gives it causal independence of its environment. The family's responses to subjective incentives and demands are too commonly determining influences to permit us to trace its evolution in such a way as to show that every detail of structure and function is a product of its reaction to external environmental conditions; but its general trend, nevertheless, reveals responsiveness to its social setting.

There is a minimum of biologic and social service that the family must assume, or society soon reaches a dead end. Even in these activities, however, great diversity is possible so long as the essential contributions are made. There is nothing, therefore, to forbid future variations at least as great as those which family life has taken during the historic period. Although each past development, if research could retrace its steps, would appear a product of causal interaction, not all of this could be charged either to the influence of the physical environment or to social need. The institution itself has contributed to its own evolution, and therefore much of the impact of the physical and social environment is indirect through the medium of individuals. This triple deposit—physical environment, social need, and internal contributions—fused together and carried forward by the processes of social heredity and cultural transmission explains the possibility of the varied forms the family takes, the complexity that has always baffled those who have tried to trace the history of the family as a social institution from its primitive forms to the present. Unfortunately for such undertakings, even on the preliterate level great diversity appears, and nowhere is there the clear-cut environmental relationship that is necessary

to explain and describe a continuous development from the lowest levels of human culture to the present.

If, however, any specific family form is selected, its reciprocal relation with out-of-the-family environment shows clearly that there may not be complete adaptation, since with so much coming from the past as well as the present, the family is in fact found to respond to two environments. It is easy to point out that this defeats thoroughgoing adaptation to the prevailing environmental conditions and thereby creates a lag. But this criticism hardly does justice to the situation. The family has a function to perform in meeting demands and incentives that may be historically past but, in so far as they are embodied in the living persons who constitute the family, become as immediate and compelling as are the objective, external circumstances. The family therefore does what the occasion demands; it compromises between past and present, becomes a mediator of clashing interests personified in individualistic attitudes. This not only constitutes one of its purposes, but the family by so functioning helps to maintain its vitality. Moreover, there is a duality in the interactions of the family with its environment. Some of these interactions are such as to justify their being charged directly to the family as a social institution. Others, however, and this is much the more common, are indirect. The family contacts its environment through the personality of its various members. As a result of this, the same influences, as they gain entrance into the family, come with individual modifications.

The physical environment

The direct responses which the family makes to its social setting do not lessen the importance of the physical environment. It may be rarely possible to trace the influence of the latter in a specific stimulus-response relationship, but that fact does not minimize the basic significance of the physical circumstances. The environment to which the family reacts is a composite in which it is difficult to separate the physical from the social

elements in any effort to uncover the specific responses the family makes to the two types of circumstances. If the physical environment had an exclusive, determining control it would be an easy task to catalogue family structure and function according to climate and similar influences. The elaborateness of the total environment and the interrelations of the physical and social make such a classification arbitrary and futile.

The family nevertheless is played upon by conditions that are distinctly physical rather than social, and this appears in modern life in the changes that have come to the family as a result of discoveries and inventions that have reshaped the basic physical environment.[1] The physical conditions that surround the family affect so widely the life of the people concerned that it becomes difficult to untangle the line of causation that operates upon the domestic institution. An analysis can be made with assurance of a particular physical condition as it brings about a certain social consequence, but this may not strike the family with full force. For example, the overcrowding of their pasture land with sheep may bring to the Navajo Indians a poverty that, carried far enough, would destroy the tribe, but this increasing destruction of the means of livelihood may not show in any drastic change of family habits or domestic stability. On the other hand, contact with the alien culture of whites may manifest itself much more openly as an undermining influence as the individuals affected bring into the family new habits and attitudes. In spite of this, the significance of the habitat of the Navajos is reflected in household practices, and these in turn contribute to the quality and content of family experience.

The same principle is illustrated by a family that moves from a submarginal agricultural area to a mill village, or from a city to a farm home. The environmental influences which produce the change are physical and social, welded together with such a complexity of stimulus and response that any satisfactory description must recognize the total environment. There may

[1] J. K. Folsom, *The Family*, chaps. VII, VIII.

also be an intrusion of social incentives that will blunt or exaggerate the effect of the physical environment. We smile at the picture Somerset Maugham[2] gives of the Englishman dressing for his solitary dinner night after night on his rubber plantation in the tropics, but this symbolizes a resistance to climate and to the native ways that in part may explain the success of the British as builders of a far-flung empire. The necessity of adaptation is recognized, but at the same time it is conditioned by values that counteract the influences of the physical setting. This principle, which can be so clearly seen in spectacular cases, always operates. There are limits beyond which it cannot go without risking survival, and the effect of time has to be taken into account, for a physical setting, if continuously at work, will in time prove itself the basic background of the family; but even then, its effectiveness is for the most part indirect through the medium of the total culture of the people, so that the family may seem to be reacting chiefly to its social environment.

The mobility of the Negro population in the United States after the Civil War and emancipation provides one of the most impressive records of the influence of change of physical environment upon family life in modern history. Individuals detached themselves from their former family ties, and entire households moved away from their customary place of abode. In spite of legislative attempts to check this restlessness, by 1910 nearly one and a third million Negroes had left the state of their birth, going mostly to southern cities. Four hundred thousand had, however, separated themselves from the South and were living in the North.

The World War of 1914-18 accelerated this urbanization of Negroes, and the effect of the new and rapid migration from the rural South to industrial centers, especially to those in the North, brought even greater disturbance than that following the Civil War. The habit changes demanded by the new environment, the loss of former values and contacts, the alien traditions

[2] "The Outstation," *East and West*, pp. 267-295.

encountered, the economic insecurity, and the fierce impact of unfamiliar cultural conditions in the congested and slum areas forced a domestic transformation and readaptation without parallel in the United States. It is a story of the rapid evolution of a family system in the effort to adjust to a different physical and cultural environment.[3]

The family and inventions

Time has another importance that appears when we consider a discovery or an invention that radically changes the ways and life of a people and thereby enters causally into the family. The immediate effect or indeed the consequences at any chosen period may not disclose what over a longer duration results in the structure or the functioning of the family. The invention of the automobile or the radio, or the increasing dissemination of the knowledge regarding contraception, for example, brought results that are neither specific nor stationary. There is a social adaptation, a progression in the use made of the new resource, which is more significant than the first results of the invention or the discovery. This is something more than merely the lag brought by habits constructed before the new resource came into being, and therefore giving resistance. There is also ushered in a new line of development which in turn requires an original social adaptation that must go through experimental steps as a novel adjustment. The automobile, for example, as it affected the family cannot be interpreted merely by the disturbance it caused to old habits; its deeper meaning is that it began a new order which required not only breaking from the past but constructing habits and attitudes that were a genuine social departure. Its significance for the family is not the lag it produced, but the opening it provided for a new line of progress, or at least a change, which in turn, as it affected the family, also brought another progress or change. It is this forward move-

[3] E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States,* Parts IV and V.

ment of the problem that makes it so difficult to detect at any point of time what an invention is doing to the family. So long as the social changes go forward rapidly, any taking stock of prevailing consequences, however useful for a description of the family at the moment, throws too feeble a light upon the movement still in progress to permit us to say that our findings reveal what has happened to the family.

Each invention must be interpreted as one contribution to a great complexity whose significance cannot be uncovered unless it is regarded as a social pooling of resources, and this means that no influence of an invention or discovery can stand alone so as to make it an independent line of causation as it affects the family.

The family and environmental adjustment

In order to understand the significance of the family as it enters into a reciprocal contact with environment, emphasis must be placed upon the fact that it is a social institution. It is not a mere department of social activities, docile in its reception of influences that pour forth from a physical or a social environment, but an organization that seeks to perpetuate values as well as to receive them. If environmental demands, therefore, are made the standard of judgment, the family can always be indicted for some degree of failure to adapt to outside circumstances. This is the price that any social institution has to pay for the maintenance of its individuality.

If the life of the family could be limited to a special service that could prove its worth only by meeting the demands originating outside itself, its inadequacy would always constitute a maladjustment; but the family has its own interests to maintain, and these are related to human needs and incentives as certainly as are those that represent environmental welfare. The family's contact with its physical and social setting therefore may be aggressive and resistant rather than passive and hospitable to the influences it encounters as it functions.

To insist that the test of social adequacy is whether the family responds and adjusts to the pressure it encounters means locating human values exclusively outside the family, which would destroy its integrity as a social institution. To insist upon a conformity is to assume a dogmatism that the facts never justify as to what constitutes progress. The mere existence of physical or social conditions does not justify their interpretation as indispensable or favorable to human need. Especially is this true of social conditions, and in a highly complex society the greater part of the influence of the physical environment as it strikes the family has been transposed and appears as social conditions.

It is not difficult in any time of rapid change to point out the backwardness of the family in its adaptation to prevailing circumstances. Judgment, however, cannot be safely based on any one-way interaction. The backwardness of the family may become a positive element in the whole situation. The resistance of the family may affect the working of the environment, and if this slows up change it is not too much to pay for a relationship that forbids the standards of progress being set up as conformity to what for the moment happens to prevail. Nothing in the long run is so important to human welfare as the prevention of any externalizing of the values for which and by which men and women live. Human nature by its use of the family has organized its best defense against this risk of having all its values placed outside itself. This, of course, does not mean that it is possible for the family to cut itself away from its surroundings, or that it can safely ignore changing conditions. It does, however, indicate that adjustment is a two-way process, and that the family by its guardianship of profound human motivations saves itself from merely registering in favorable fashion the inflow of physical and social circumstances.

The inability of the family to adjust to a rapidly changing environment slows up or at least limits the power of the environment to control human responses, and this in the long run proves favorable to the quality of adjustment that human welfare needs. The failure of the family may bring to it disorganization

and instability. For the moment, therefore, the critic may insist that the backwardness of the family—that is, its internal resistance to external pressure—weakens it and hurts its function. To have it otherwise would mean removing our most effective protection against environmental tyranny. However, one cannot be content with merely pointing out an immediate confusion or instability. This also represents a line of adjustment. The difficulties of the family re-echo in emotional protests that motivate interference with the environmental influences. Since quickness of change or thoroughness of change does not guarantee progress, there is security for both the race and the individual in these experiences of confusion that come to the family when change is great or rapid.

The social health of the family is determined not by its strength, its rigidity, or even by its stability but by the value it has as a means of safeguarding the contributions that have to come to men and women from an intimate, secured association of persons held together by a special sense of kinship. When the family fails in this ministration, the solution may lie not in the changing of the structure or the function of the family but in a reconstruction of environmental influences.

It is well also, in any attempt to appraise the adaptability of the family to its environment, to keep in mind the precariousness of any movement of change. Change does not pass along a narrow, specific, independent line of development, but as it moves it penetrates on a wide front the complex advance that includes other similar developments, with the consequence that change brings change. In one of the most thoroughgoing of social surveys, the report of President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends, it is pointed out how interrelated social change is.[4] Change can neither be frozen into immobility, nor can it be restrained from effecting other changes. The report on social trends also calls attention to the death rate of inventions,[5] forcing a replacement which basically influences change.

[4] *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, vol. I, p. lxx.
[5] *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. xxvi.

The family would be at the mercy of a welter of social, mechanical, and physical occurrences if it did not maintain as its nucleus inherent values and functions. Otherwise, it would be a reflection of a social extraversion since, with a peculiarity all its own, it gets vitality as a social institution through the personal services its members distribute in their intimate interactions. The church, the school, and the government are the social institutions closest to it in this respect, but only the first has the same task and therefore needs such a tenacity of inner purposes in its adjustment responses to the environment.

The family's sensitivity to change

Change and stability are antitheses. This is as true outside the family as it is within. The rate of obsolescence of machinery, for example, furnishes one of the great expenses of modern industry. A machine is hardly made before it begins to have improvement. Disturbing as this is both to capital and labor, fostering large organizations on the one hand and technological unemployment on the other, the instability due to change, looked at from its manufacturing purpose, creates no problem. The larger output it brings causes social disturbances at various points, but the changeableness of the machine itself constitutes not only one of its characteristics but also a feature that gives it its advantage. In other words, its value lies in part in its certainty of change and improvement. The original invention is frequently impracticable, useless, except for the fact that once the mechanism is given birth its progress is assured. If the machine itself incurred the instability that would come to it had it consciousness, a very different sort of problem would appear. Then the confusion would not merely be the effect of greater productivity, unemployment, difficulties of distribution, concentration of wealth, and the like, but in addition a disturbance that the machine itself would experience.

It is this peculiar quality of instability brought by change in the social realm that constitutes its power to disturb. There are

values aside from those that come from human adjustment t mechanical processes or even to social organization. We some times call these spiritual values. The important thing is to recog nize that they are basic in any program for human satisfactio and that they may be disturbed by changes in external conditions New ways of living, as a result of mechanical progress an scientific discovery, demand more than mere changes of habit they compel readjustment of these values that are both inde pendent of and conditioned by environmental circumstances The more effective the mechanical processes are in forcin changes in outlook and manner of life, the greater the disturban of the institutions that attempt to perpetuate the spiritual values

To regard the problem merely as one of acceptance, of gettin human nature to respond to the consequences of man's ow genius, is to narrow its destiny and seek its content by an extra vertive materialism that only robots could endure. It is especiall important to recognize this double meaning of adjustment t change as it affects the family. The domestic institution mus try to maintain some sort of adequate relationship with th rapid-changing external environment, but at the same time i has a ministration which may mean protecting itself from wha would occur if it were merely an attempt to meet change wit change so that it would be a docile reflection of the rapi obsolescence and replacement taking place outside. The brea in adjustment to change may be lag on the part of the family but it may also be an acceleration on the outside that eventuall brings reversal. Not every improvement in the machine i profitable. The test must be its effectiveness in a comple process. This is even more true of social values and of famil values in particular. The so-called lag may be rooted in a con serving protest, and the disturbance may be due not to th family's failure to adjust to an external flux, but rather to it success in protecting itself from the surrounding welter of rapi change.

Even in so short a period as the first third of the twentiet century, the advance of science, as shown in invention, manage

ment, and technology, has made it clear that the nature and direction of its reconstruction have been such that neither its future development, its speed, nor its range was predictable.[6] The investment of brain in the attempt to advance science through research had by 1935 in this country reached the point where the government itself employed no less than 18,372 persons in professional and scientific research.[7] This of course was but part of the national organization for the advancement of science, and throughout the world wherever modern civilization had become well entrenched, in some degree public and private enterprises were carrying on similar research activities. This means that society in the effort to further discovery and invention is investing a considerable and ever increasing part of its manpower and material wealth in the doing of what brings not only greater power and more resources, but also additional changes. Some of these were unanticipated by previous experience, and therefore brought about not only new but original results.

The construction of a mechanism heavier than air that could be made to fly is one example. It did not constitute a new idea, but its coming brought an original line of development in the habits and attitudes of men. Inventions such as this not only usher in unforeseen social conditions but also disturb, even abort, other lines of inventive development. Thus the electric light put an end to a considerable interest in the greater perfection of the gas mantle as a means of illumination; and now the airship, for good or ill, is bringing into question the effectiveness of ocean barriers as a means of national defense. In Ogburn's impressive survey of the social results of recent inventions he states that not only are the discoveries and inventions incalculable in their totality and profound in their significance, but most significant of all is their phenomenal increase from year to year.[8]

[6] Howard W. Odum, *American Social Problems*, p. 63.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[8] W. F. Ogburn, "The Influence of Invention and Discovery," *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, vol. I, chap. III.

It is the rapidity of the change more than anything else that troubles the social institutions, particularly the family. It is not too much to say that the changeableness of change is the essential disturbance. Whether this pace can be maintained for any considerable length of time, no one knows. At present there are no signs of any lessening of speed. This means that, for the immediate present at least, the family is called upon to adjust not so much to particular departures, however radical they may be in comparison with previous experience, but to the condition of continuous change itself. This is an attack on the stability of the family because its values, although they can take different forms and can be maintained in different types of homes under different codes of conduct and similar innovations, nevertheless in their constantly changing social setting must furnish the incentives of identity, perpetuity, and transcendency that have always given the family its function.

The results of such rapid change, the insecurity that accompanies such constant reconstruction and displacement, the confusion of action, and the uncertainty make it difficult for the family, because of the momentum it has to withstand, to carry on with the vigor that is necessary if it is to hold its position in human life. To realize its predicament in full measure it is necessary to think of its trying to adjust not only to rapid, continuous changing but also to the psychic consequences that come from contact with such a challenging environment. Thus to maintain its place—and it must ever be remembered that the actual experiences are those of individual persons and that the term "family" is but a concept representing these—it has to adapt itself not only to a great multitude of shifting circumstances but also to the psychic environment created by such a situation.

Psychic reaction, although this is registered in the individual members of the family, constitutes as genuine a test of adaptability as does the physical or the social order. Psychic reactions, also, as they have meaning for conduct, are registered in persons. Habits that come from living in a continuous atmosphere of flux

are as substantial as those habits that are developed to deal with certain aspects of a novel situation. The reactions of front-line fighters in the World War of 1914-18 somewhat illustrate this. They also had to adapt themselves to unfamiliar conditions, but their deeper adjustment, primarily emotional, was to the atmosphere of disorder, uncertainty, and insecurity which made war the antithesis of peace. This was recognized in their training, which attempted by every possible means to prepare them not merely to carry on certain activities but to give them the capacity to transfer to a life that repudiated every value to which they had been accustomed.

In so far as the family is in trouble it is because human nature itself has become, under the stress of such rapid change, unstable in its social habits and outlook. The reason that we make so much of the family is that it should serve as the best antidote for the dangers of such a situation, and therefore when it fails to function satisfactorily men and women are denied the emotional security that they most need. In times of social flux the family becomes more than ever the final refuge for those who can find little sense of security elsewhere. This is why the instability of the family becomes so greatly significant. It is not that it is more vulnerable than other social institutions, for on the contrary it is more resistant, but rather that its getting into difficulty demonstrates how serious and widespread general social instability has become. If the family life is in trouble, the social order is in even greater hazard. Instability is indication that there is failure of adaptation, but this does not demonstrate the lack of capacity to meet the new circumstances. Even the changeableness of change can become an accepted situation once man has had experience enough with the condition to develop the protective emotional disposition and habit that his security demands. A measure of insulation against present-day flux appears to have been acquired by modern youth most open to stimuli, for one gets the impression that contemporary young people are less disturbed by the changeableness of things than are their elders. In any case, the dangers of the present tempo are

chiefly psychic. If man can learn to control his own reactions, he will not find it so difficult to manage the material changes that have become characteristic of modern civilization.

The most impressive approach to the significance of stress in modern civilization is through essential hypertension. This affliction has become the greatest medical problem of middle age, not even excepting cancer, accounting, it is estimated, for nearly one quarter of the deaths of people past fifty years of age.[9] There is much evidence to show that hypertension is largely confined to occidental civilization, since various studies, such as those of African natives, Chinese, Buddhist priests in Ceylon, and Egyptians of the laboring class, show that hypertension seldom occurs among these peoples.[10] The American southern Negro, in spite of his African heritage, becomes a victim of hypertension two and a half times oftener than the southern white,[11] and the tendency to the disorder exists in an even greater degree.[12]

We are told that essential hypertension is the reaction of the individual to the complexities of present civilization.[13] In the background are excessive emotional reactions to life expressed in hostility and repressions. As one would expect, clinical evidence shows that the family and the interests that center about it play a major role in the incidence of hypertension.[14] Thus hypertension appears as the organic reaction to emotional mal-

[9] Edward Weiss, "Recent Advances in the Pathogenesis and Treatment of Hypertension," *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 1:181.

[10] G. Fahr, "Hypertension Heart," *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, 175:453; C. P. Donison, "Blood Pressure in African Native; Its Bearing upon Aetiology of Hyperpiesia and Arteriosclerosis," *Lancet*, 216:6; W. W. Cadbury, "The Blood Pressure of Normal Cantonese Students," *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 30 362; Abd-El-Aziz Ismail, "Aetiology of Hyperpiesis in Egyptians," *Lancet*, 2:275.

[11] V. E. Schulze and E. H. Schwab, "Arteriolar Hypertension in American Negro," *American Heart Journal*, 11·66.

[12] E. H. Schwab, D. L. Curb, J. L. Matthews, and V. E. Schulze, "Blood Pressure Response to Standard Stimulus in White and Negro Races," *Proceedings of the Society of Experimental Biology and Medicine*, 32:583.

[13] Franz Alexander, "Psychoanalytic Study of a Case of Essential Hypertension," *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 1:176.

[14] Leon J. Saul, "Hostility in Cases of Essential Hypertension," *Ibid.*, 1:160-161.

adjustment as the individual is confronted with the problem of ego-maintenance in his struggle with the conflicts invoked by his social environment. The final cause of his predicament is his own personality defined in its widest sense; and, as analysis demonstrates,[15] the influence of the family—first in childhood and then later after his marriage—has the same prominence that appears in other developments of character patterns. Sex also appears as a source of conflict and inner strain, but this again is largely a derivative of childhood experience and indirectly a consequence of the family's neglect, suggestion, lack of insight, or failure to give intelligent preparation for life.

The development of hypertension is the result of an accumulation of influences including heredity and family-caused predisposition, the accidents of personal career, and the onslaught of environmental incitation. It would be revealing if this vast factor could be statistically analyzed so that a convincing comparison could be made between the urban and the rural environment. The encroachment culturally of the former upon the latter makes any enumeration of urban sufferers in comparison with rural, interesting as it would be, a faulty means of measuring the tension liability of urban dwellers as compared with rural.

Man's survival does not demand that he become slavishly adjusted to his own creations, but rather that he learn to handle them so as to conserve his basic interests. His instability both in and out of the family becomes itself an inner drive toward a better use of his inventive resources. The significance of this can be made apparent only by studying some specific environmental influence, like urbanization, that at present is weakening family stability.

Urbanization and the family

One of the most striking of the social phenomena of modern life has been the increase of urban population. Wherever modern civilization has become entrenched through the growth of

[15] Franz Alexander, "Psychological Aspects of Medicine," *Ibid.*, 1:14-16.

industry and commerce, there has been a population drift from the rural environment to the urban. This has been especially true in the United States.[16] This transference of people, however, is but half the story, and the less important half. The more significant fact is that there has been a spread of the culture generated in the cities to towns, villages, and even into the farming territory. Modern communication, as everybody recognizes, has wiped out much of the distinction, as far as attitude of mind and ways of living are concerned, between the rural and the urban. At least there has been an outward spread of the influence of city life, and no corresponding intaking of cultural contributions from the open country to the city. The rural drift has been in the form of people who have moved from the one environment to the other. The modern city also is something more than merely the continuation of an earlier concentration of population. The modern metropolitan community is indeed a creation of modern science which has furnished the means of transportation and communication, making possible a new social and economic entity.[17] The same facilities of applied science have made it possible for the city to permeate a great extent of nonurban territory.

Since the cities provide the dominant culture, any attempt to get at the position of the family in modern life carries the investigator to the city. It is there that we find the environmental aggressiveness which is most responsible for the instability of the family as a social institution. Although this has greater meaning than formerly, it is not something new in social experience. The urbanizing of people has always been reflected in social conditions that have worked against the vitality of the family. This indictment of cities has been made again and again by observers of its social influences, but perhaps never more interestingly than by William Cobbett, who insisted upon calling London "The Wen."

[16] R. D. McKenzie, "The Rise of Metropolitan Communities," *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, vol. I, chap. IX.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 444.

The dispersion of the Wen is the only real difficulty that I see in settling the affairs of the nation and restoring it to a happy state. But dispersed it *must* be; and if there be a half a million, or more, of people to suffer, the consolation is, that the suffering will be divided into half a million of parts. As if the swelling out of London, naturally produced by the funding system, were not sufficient; as if the evil were not sufficiently great from the inevitable tendency of the system of loans and funds, our pretty gentlemen must resort to positive institutions to augment the population of the Wen. They found that the increase of the Wen produced an increase of thieves and prostitutes, an increase of all sorts of diseases, an increase of miseries of all sorts; they saw that taxes drawn up to one point produced these effects; they must have a "*penitentiary*," for instance to check the evil, and that they must needs have in the Wen! So that here were a million of pounds, drawn up in taxes, employed not only to keep the thieves and prostitutes still in the *Wen*, but to bring up to the Wen workmen to build the penitentiary, who and whose families, amounting, perhaps to thousands, make an addition to the cause of that crime and misery, to check which is the object of the penitentiary![18]

It is the dominance and spread of urban culture that is creating a problem quite unlike that which in times past has been recognized by the student of social life. Even here the difference is one of degree. The great city has always generated culture and in some measure spread it through the population. Any comparison, however, with what has been true is now misleading because the quantity and the quality of this diffusion of culture have been so radically changed by the resources of applied science. Population-security cannot now be left to those living in nonurban territory, for more and more the trend is toward a cultural uniformity in which the influence of the city is dominant. Even if the population drift could be reversed and there were an emptying of the cities by a back-to-the-farm-and-village movement, this would not release human nature in any great degree from the feelings, the habits, and the life-attitudes

[18] William Cobbett, *Rural Rides*, vol. 1, p. 43.

that are characteristic of urban culture. These are being so thoroughly nationalized that the grip of the city would not in any appreciable degree be loosened by the mere change of residence.

When these facts are applied to the family, it appears that the social institution, in order to carry on its functions successfully, needs to become better adjusted to the influences that pour in upon it as a result of the increasing urbanization of life. To invite it to gain stability by isolation is to forget that the power of the city's influences comes from the appeal they make to the great majority of men and women. The present dominance of the city might be lessened, but only by a reconstruction of interest that one cannot reasonably expect in view of present trends. Instead, every evidence points to an even greater predominance of the cultural contribution coming from the city, and if the modern family is to function satisfactorily and achieve stability, it must be through some other program than an attempt to retreat to the country. The predicament of the family as a social institution is not unlike that of the school and the church. Each of these must successfully wrestle with a city-controlled culture. This means that good adjustment and security and in the long run even survival depend upon the directing of this cultural dominance of the cities rather than upon any effort to escape from the social environment in which the institution of the family is so firmly fixed.

In order to get at the detrimental influences of the city as at present they affect the stability of the domestic institutions, it is necessary to distinguish between problems that are due to the concentration of population and those that come from the dominance of urban culture. The first is as ancient as the existence of the large city itself; the second, in its modern development, is something new. This does not mean that only of late has there been a spread of urban influences into adjacent territory. The history of London, Paris, and Edinburgh, for example, clearly shows that such urban centers have always generated culture and passed it to their environs; but the modern situation is different because the resources of modern science have made this

cultural outflow of the cities dominant over the influences of the physical environment. The life in the small village many miles away from the nearest city is fashioned in matters that concern the family more by its cultural importations than by what independently comes forth from its natural setting.

A clear recognition of this distinction between present and former urbanization leads to a different interpretation of the sensitiveness of the family than would have been possible before the advent of science had given the cities their decisive influence over much of the way of life of men and women and even children throughout most of the modern world. The problems that gather about the concentration of population are beginning to take on a new meaning. They exist not, as was once true, because they can be escaped only by replacing urban with rural. They persist because the resources that science now makes available have not had sufficient use or adequate directing. Here we find one of the greatest of the social lags. But, although much change is required, there is nothing to suggest that intelligent planning will not remove from the city much of the influence associated with the physical environment that has so long acted detrimentally upon the family as a social institution.

The cultural contributions of urbanization when they are separated from the liabilities of congestion, lack of open spaces, poor housing, inadequate health provision, municipal corruption, and so forth present a very different picture. Urban cultural dominance then becomes merely the outpouring of the most vital, progressive, or at least changeable, and the most highly organized social resources. This explains its dominance, and it needs only to be made favorable to human adjustment to be advantageous to family life. The danger to the family is not that urban culture so widely permeates American life, but rather that what the city now sends forth is so largely discolored by influences originating in its environmental backwardness and is accepted by the people widely through lack of a discriminating social maturity. Much of this is such a clear challenge to modern intelligence that progress seems inevitable.

What is more important is that already a large part of this cultural distribution, although it comes so largely from the city, is independent of both its physical and social surroundings. It is an intellectual and social concentration which uses the city's facilities because they excel in resources of distribution and communication, but the content is in great degree national or even international rather than urban. It pours into the city as certainly as it flows out. This explains its adaptability. At present in great degree it takes on an urban coloring, but there is enough of interaction between the city and its environs to suggest that this cultural distribution as it comes to the family is becoming less and less the exportation of an urbanized content and more and more a cultural complex independent of place.

Just as the family must adjust itself to change as a modern social trait, so it must likewise accustom itself to this reception of cultural influences that come forth from the city, because there reception and distribution can be more efficiently organized than where there is not so great a concentration of science. The radio is an especially interesting example: not only is it one of the most effective of all the instruments of distribution, but it is likewise, although for the most part located in the city, extremely sensitive to out-of-the-city values and responses. In the past, the city has dominated by its superior facility for cultural extension. The radio, however, by reaching people without regard to proximity or contact furnishes a new form of cultural exchange and by so doing reaches those who wish to enjoy its distribution without living in the city. The low quality of so much of its offering does not lessen the significance it has as a substitute for former urban methods of exchange of feeling and thought.

When Samuel Johnson exclaimed that he could not conceive of anybody's living outside of London, he was evidently thinking most of the fruits of London life such as are now gathered in our cities for cultural distribution. One need not live within the city to enjoy a great part of the culture it generates. It is now not a choice between isolation and city habitation. Instead it has

increasingly become a problem of personal selection because of the quantity of values that our cities distribute. Here, perhaps, is the future menace of urban dominance. Its effectiveness requires for social security a democratic control through the freedom of the individual's selection. On the other hand, it invites cultural despotism. For any modern form of tyranny, it offers a mechanism of coercion unequaled in previous human history.

Urbanization, tension, and the family

During the nineteenth century when the spread of urban culture was greatly limited due to the inadequate means of transportation and communication, the tension provoked by urban ways of living was localized. Anyone sensitive to environmental atmosphere felt the difference as he moved from city to country or from country to city. It was the crowding, noise, and pace of city life that were impressive. A similar reaction comes in our own time to those who pass back and forth between the two environments. The urban distinctions now, however, come primarily from the structure of the city, including the effect of this upon habit and social temperament. There are location characteristics, the conditions that have come into being to meet the needs of a greatly concentrated population reacting to its place of settlement both physically and psychically. These stand in such sharp contrast to what is found in the village or open country situation that they catch the attention of the least sophisticated as he passes from one habitation to the other.

These aspects of the city might be described in the vocabulary of a Thoreau as noise, rush, confusion, closeness, and multiplicity as the physical environment bombards the senses with stimuli that cannot be duplicated in the town, village, or open country. This form of urban tension the city holds within itself. To absorb it, one must go where it is.

The profounder discharge that comes from urban life bringing stress to the family as a social institution is the tension associated

with the city's distribution of culture. This penetrates at a distance, and its effectiveness has nothing to do with location or the physical conditions of habitation. It is best described as the tension of modern civilization, but even so it cannot be understood apart from its primary source, the city. Since this tension is now widely recognized as the great burden man has laid upon himself by his highly developed civilization, urban dominance takes on a new meaning.

As a consequence of our present situation, any slicing of the population into the two portions, *urban* and *rural,* becomes fallacious unless full recognition is made of the cultural extention of city-bred psychic and social suggestions, incentives, attitudes, and resources. Any attempt to trace and measure urban dominance in terms of tension proves inconclusive because its effectiveness is less a matter of where one lives than how one lives and how one responds to an environmental pressure that is independent of place.[19] For example, one might choose to test the city and country by the number of persons admitted from the two environments to mental hospitals. The census returns, when examined for the purpose of comparison, give evidence that more inmates come from the urban than from the rural environment. It is also true that more are entered from large cities than from smaller cities.

When, however, the matter is examined closely, the significance of this difference becomes uncertain as a means of insight into the tension differences of the two types of population. One must suspect that rural neurotics tend to migrate to the city. Syphilitic and alcoholic psychoses are more common in the city; and since they furnish a large proportion of the insane, it might seem as if the greater hazard of the urban environment, even if only indirectly related to tension, were established. However, the significance of city resources must be brought into the picture. For nearly three-quarters of a century it has been recognized that the accessibility of institutions influences com-

[19] There are of course differences in cities. *See* E. L. Thorndike, *Your City*.

mitment.[20] The superior diagnostic facilities of the city must be taken into account also. In addition, in the city the mentally ill person cannot so easily be cared for in the home, and the disposition to place him in an institution is thereby encouraged by living conditions.

Since the city dweller is subject to double tension—that coming from local conditions and that which, although originating in the city, is independent and spread abroad—it appears reasonable to assume a greater urban liability, but the matter is too complex for any satisfactory statistical proof. The sophistication, susceptibility, and anonymity of congested populations would seem to explain the fact that the experience of the United States army during the World War revealed a considerable urban preponderance of drug addiction. The ratios per hundred thousand drafted men were 104 for urban districts and 26 for rural.[21] However, drug habits cannot safely be used as a means of comparing the degrees of environmental tension. Possibly the safest measurement would be the incidence of heart disease in the two environments, were it possible to separate heart trouble due to emotional stress from that with other origins and rule out all such complicating elements as the diagnosing physician's freedom, for example, in stating the cause of death, which make statistics of heart failure an imperfect basis of comparison.

In any analysis of urban influence on the family, it is impossible to make a clear demarcation between that which comes from the localized life of the city and that which is charged to the city, because the city possesses in greatest measure the resources of modern civilization. Nevertheless, to ignore this urban dualism leads to a misapprehension of the problems of environmental origin that face family life today. Conditions affecting the family adversely that come from the first source can be largely eliminated by a more intelligent use of applied science, better planning, and more mature socialization. The difficulties due to the command the city has of the dynamics of

[20] A. J. Rosanoff, *Manual of Psychiatry and Mental Hygiene*, p. 21.
[21] A. G. Love and C. B. Davenport, *Defects Found in Drafted Men.*

present civilization require more radical changes in order to lessen domestic instability. Family life is merely registering, as do other social institutions, the impact of the prevailing cultural environment. The reason that the family occupies so prominent a place in the discussion of such problems is the ease with which its instability is recognized and the wide realization of the seriousness of this disturbance reflected by the domestic institution.

In so far as the family is in trouble because it reacts to the content and momentum of modern civilization, any hope of relief must come from a reconstruction of human adaptability to the man-created environment. The plight of the family is but an uncovering in one social organization of the dangers inherent in man's evolutionary trend. The elaborate accumulation of physical and social resources that man has gathered by means of his frontal lobe, his hand, and his endocrine endowment is becoming an increasing burden to the organism.[22] On the emotional level, this becomes still clearer; for the primitive emotions, although they present a wider front to the environmental attack, in great measure are denied their one-time function of reinforcing the human organism's attempt to meet a crisis. Energy that in more primitive conditions would flow effectively into discharge merely flood the body to its detriment. On the social level, the same situation repeats itself. Stimuli pour forth from the environment that has been created by human artifice and the individual, according to his sensitiveness, accumulates tension. Although for purposes of discussion, this can be sliced in three portions—the physical, the psychic, and the social —it remains one process, an inadequate adaptation to the total environment. The family becomes unstable because it is composed of persons who are organically, emotionally, and socially overstimulated. Domesticity is weakened in proportion as the individual fails as a total personality to make his adaptations biologically sound, psychically effective, and socially satisfying.

Family instability as it reflects the pressure of modern civilization cannot be dealt with in isolation. Man, who has done so well

[22] George Crile, *Diseases Peculiar to Civilized Man*, p. 19.

with his environment, must for his own safety do better with himself. His present difficulties, like the coming of pain in the body, draw attention to the necessity of better adaptation. The importance of the family, the function it undertakes, and the satisfactions it can provide make its difficulties impressive. It also offers a promising opening for the inward reconstruction that has become prerequisite to a more adequate adjustment to the conditions of modern life. Such self-direction through using the resources of the family, although frequently advocated by leaders in social thought, as the next two chapters will show, represents a new departure; but not more so than the rapid development of applied science during the last two centuries. Both programs were foreshadowed during the long stretch of human experience. It is merely that the line that started when primitive man first picked up the unpolished stone and used it as a simple tool has so taken precedence that man has become docile in the presence of the overwhelming environment he has himself created.

The protective function of the family obviously has always passed beyond that parental care of the young which in the beginning permitted the institution to cross over from the animal and become a human experience. Marriage also has served as a refuge and as an insurance. To a very great extent in times past, this service has primarily centered about the providing of physical and economic security, with an increasing trend toward emphasis on the fellowship that affection alone demands and gives. Modern life is creating the need of the family's taking over a protective function required by the complexity and intensity of the modern environment. If the family at present is in retreat on account of encroachment of other competing organizations that are taking from it a considerable measure of its former responsibilities, its best defense is the enlarging of those ministrations in which it cannot be outrivaled. One of these is to cushion human nature against an avaricious environment which one must expect to be more aggressive, increasingly complex, and more and more effectively distributed. Thus the

statement that a man's home is his castle takes on a modern meaning. Such a service is becoming more than a social need. The sensitiveness of the organism open to the bombardment of an artificial environment of unprecedented intensity reveals that such family functioning is fundamentally therapeutic and biologically conserving. Domesticity by becoming selective lessens the impact of the stimulations characteristic of urban-dominated culture.

Modern civilization and reproduction

It has long been known that population increase as evidenced by birth rate and death rate tends to be greater in rural districts than in the city. Theories as to the reason for this have led to much controversial discussion.[23] The popularizing of birth control makes hazardous any attempt to use the birth rate as a means of demonstrating the influence of city life on fertility. In a recent study, the fertility rates of rural women were greater than those of urban women in every geographic section considered. The fertility rate of women on the farms in the east was about 50 per cent higher than that of women living in cities, and in the west it was about 75 per cent higher.[24] Assuming that contraception plays a major part in the decrease of the birth rate, there is evidence to support the belief that birth control, first practiced among the professional and business classes, spread to skilled labor, then to the unskilled group, reaching the farmers and country people last.[25] The birth rate in the United States, which seems to have been extremely high from 1790 to 1820, has been falling since then, and markedly from the beginning of the present century. Although there is every reason to suppose that this decline has been accelerated by the advent of contra-

[23] Niles Carpenter, *The Sociality of City Life*, pp. 192-201.

[24] Katherine Berry, "Differential Fertility According to Geographic Areas in the United States," *Quarterly Bulletin of the Milbank Memorial Fund*, 9:78-94.

[25] Frank W. Notestein, "The Decrease in Size of Families from 1890 to 1910," *ibid.*, 9:181-188; W. S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, "The Population of the Nation," *Recent Social Trends in the United States*, vol. 1, p. 43.

ception, it is also evident that other influences have been at work and that there is no possibility of disentangling causation in such a complex phenomenon.

There are good grounds for assuming that reproduction would be affected by an increase of infertility brought forth in some measure by the development of civilization. It may be difficult to prove, as Herbert Spencer suggested, that human energy is available for individuation and for genesis or reproduction and that an excess along one line lessens the output along the other, but there is solid reason for holding to the belief that the increasing strain associated with modern civilization operates slowly to reduce the energies available for human reproduction.[26] This would be in accord with what Darwin has stated regarding animal reproduction, "Any change in the habits of life, whatever these habits may be, if great enough tends to affect in an inexplicable manner the powers of reproduction." The evidence is conclusive that in the case of animals any radical change of existence tends to show its effect in generative losses. For example, frequently the removal of the animal from his natural environment to captivity issues in sterility.

The decline in the birth rate is almost world-wide, according to the 1938-1939 edition of the League of Nations Statistical Year Book.[27] Even Italy and Germany, although by heroic efforts they have slightly reversed the trend, have not been able to bring the birth rate back to its prewar level. Italy's record is, in the light of its propaganda to increase births, evidence of how well entrenched the birth trend is. In 1911-1913 the rate was 31.7 per 1,000 population; in 1936, 22.4; and in 1938 only 23.6. Germany's ratios are: in 1911-1913, 27.0 per 1,000 population; in 1933, 14.7; and in 1938, 19.7. England and Wales appear to be facing a decline in population during the next thirty years of approximately 22 per cent. Even in Japan the birth rate declined from 34.9 per 1,000 in the period 1911-1913 to 30.6 per 1,000 in 1938.

[26] S. R. Meaker, *Human Sterility*, p. 9.
[27] Reported in the *New York Times*, July 23, 1939.

The use of contraception to space the coming of children or to prevent parenthood is a major factor in the falling birth rate. There is also much unwanted childlessness, judging from the number of barren couples who seek gynecological assistance; yet it is estimated that the percentage of childless unions is now fully six times greater in this country than it was in the eighteenth century.[28]

It seems reasonable to assume—indeed, it would be strange if it were not true—that the organism that discloses in high blood pressure, diabetes, heart and kidney diseases an increased liability as it encounters the strenuousness of modern life must also in some degree suffer from the same causation in its reproductive processes. Recent medical insight resulting from progress in penetrating the intricacies of endocrine activities, while it does not justify the extreme position that infertility is only of endocrine origin, does suggest that along this line of body behavior the tensions born of environmental experience do become detrimental to human reproduction biologically, just as the environment psychically and socially operates on motivation and encourages contraceptive practices.

There are, however, too many complexities to permit any clear-cut relationship between the excesses of modern culture and infertility. A simpler demonstration of the relationship would be the lessening of breast milk[29] and the inability of the mother to nurse the child. Here, also, personal inclination complicates analysis. Nevertheless, if there be evidence that the human mother is losing ground in her ability to suckle the young, then we have a tremendously significant announcement that modern life is striking at the family on its biological level. Artificial feeding from choice also has significance as an evidence of environmental influence operating on a different level to antagonize family welfare.

[28] F. H. Hankins, "Civilization and Fertility," *General Assembly of the International Population Union, London, 1931.* Cited in S. G. Berkow, *Childless*, p. 26.

[29] Crile, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Any effect of urbanization upon fertility needs separation in two categories. In one, we find influences that are urban in that they are products of local conditions; these have a possible range from lack of sunlight to the greater prevalence of venereal diseases. In the other category belongs cultural material for which the city serves as headquarters and distributing center. It is obvious that this will become less and less distinguishable as something possessed exclusively by urban people. Like contraceptive knowledge, it will spread through the population irrespective of place of habitation. Such a distribution tends to break down class as well as territorial differences. In former centuries it was the ruling intellectual and wealthy groups who possessed the cultural luxuries that have been credited with the responsibility for their class suicide. In our time the much more effective distribution of such luxuries, commercially or politically motivated, reaches all classes, and any adverse influence this may bring the family must menace the entire population.

Housing and the family

The persistence of city slums has tended to make the housing problem seem an evil of urbanism. This is, of course, not true. Not only are there many rural and village families that are inadequately housed, denied the facilities necessary for a normal standard of living, even lacking in the sanitation necessary for physical security, but many are also as overcrowded, so far as room space is concerned, as are slum dwellers. Even so, the most spectacular bad housing is in the cities, and its menace so apparent and impressive that it is reasonable to expect that for the present the greatest progress in housing reform will take place there. It is in the cities also that we can expect the social pressure that is necessary before there can be much improvement in slum clearance and new home construction.

More is needed than merely to wipe out the inadequate sheltering of a large proportion of city dwellers. The modern family cannot have a suitable dwelling until there are radical changes

in both the building and equipment of home dwellings in the country and village as well as the city. In spite of considerable improvement, no feature of the home is relatively more backward than housing. The mood of city life provides the more favorable environment for the departures that are necessary to furnish the modern family with a modern place to dwell. Although the problem at present takes an economic form, it is inherently social. There is no lack of the material, labor, or wealth necessary for adequate housing, but there is a social toleration of the failure of both private industry, including labor organization, and government to provide a multitude of families with the minimum facilities of good housing. Present conditions demonstrate a neglect of the family in one of its most elemental needs. The slum, rural and urban, stands as a monument to a social immaturity that tolerates the exploiting of the fundamental human institution, the home.

If bad housing brought forth only discomfort, it would penalize the family; but affecting as it does the growth and the quality of the population,[30] the value and security of the family as an institution, it is a major social menace,[31] with many of its consequences distant and indirect and therefore not vigorously resented by militant public opinion. One example is the effect that the cost of housing has upon the birth of children. If the family cannot afford to have the space necessary to maintain what it has been accustomed to as a proper standard of living without limiting itself to one or two children or none at all, prudential motives are likely to decide the reproductive program. This, however, will not be true of those relatively indifferent to the maintenance of a proper standard of living. Thus the housing situation penalizes normal functioning of the family and adds its contribution to the dysgenic influences operating on population growth. If one looks to the slums as a means of eliminating inferior stock, this defense is implausible. Births indicating indif-

[30] W. S. Thompson, "The Effect of Housing upon Population Growth," *Quarterly Bulletin of the Milbank Memorial Fund*, 16:359.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 362-364.

ference to consequences are not discouraged but furnish a large proportion of those who throw upon society a burden that takes many forms and utilizes a large portion of social energy that has to be expressed in protection, segregation, hospitalization, and relief.

The trend in our metropolitan centers is toward decreasing the size of the dwelling. Although the size of the apartment and the amount of floor space per individual tend to increase, the family dwelling unit is growing smaller. The explanation of this appears to be the diminishing size of the family. However, what is more significant is the assumption of this fact by those who express it architecturally. What is more promising is the fact that the single family house appears to be holding its own. The regional influence at present brings about local differences. Cities as near together as New York and Philadelphia show great variation in the popularity of the apartment and the single-family house. In 1920, for example, the highest excesses of families over dwellings was 71.4 per cent in New York, and only 12.4 per cent in Philadelphia.[32]

The trend toward growth in the metropolitan district as distinguished from the city proper is influencing city housing,[33] and if this movement is accelerated, as seems likely, the effects of congestion will be lessened. Motor transportation and suburban development are making it possible for an increasing number of persons who must draw their income from urban occupations to live outside the city proper. Their response to this opportunity reveals how strongly they seek home life in dwellings that afford greater detachment, privacy, and freedom than they could have as roomers or renters in the city. This ecological drift away from congested areas discloses that much of the city population has been the result not of choice but of economic necessity. Science is not only making it possible for a multitude of people to live according to their preference, but is at the same time bringing into their homes urban advantages that once could

[32] Folsom, *op. cit.*, p. 200.
[33] McKenzie, *op. cit.*

be had only, and then in less degree, by keeping house in the city.

Although the influence of the dwelling affects the well-being of the family, it is also true that no one type of living arrangement is best for all families. This conclusion of a Chicago investigator[34] is in accord with home experience everywhere. Preference—that is, home-decided inclination—must be included in any program of adaptability, as must also adjustment to the structural and economic characteristics of the family. This element of personal choice is reflective of both personal and social background. The apartment is one of the housing products of these influences and, although it flourishes chiefly in the city, it is a needed type of dwelling even in small communities for those who maintain the same sort of family that has in the city created such a demand for living quarters that simplify housekeeping. The working wife, the unmarried man or woman who wants to live alone, the childless couple who seek small quarters exist even in villages, and the ordinary house is unadapted to their needs.

There is no occasion for merely duplicating the city type, but an apartment adjusted to a different setting would provide the home-keeping arrangements most advantageous for many families living outside cities.

Significance of familial environments

When we deal with families in the concrete we are forced to recognize that the environmental influences to which each home reacts are many rather than one. Each aspect of the family life has its special background. Even the family itself when considered as a totality of experience furnishes a series of environments, each acting upon the members in interaction and upon the meaning of their common relationship. In this respect the family may be compared to a flowering bulb. Each layer makes its contribution to the family enterprise, as in the plant each

[34] Day Monroe, *Chicago Families.*

nourishes the central blossom. The entire composite may be regarded as the family, or the concept may be limited to the meaningful relationships, the essence of the organization.

Community contacts, for example, bring to the family routines, sanctions, values, and opportunities which may be thought of as a part of family life or as influences of environmental origin operating upon it. A family shuttled about from one community to another to meet the changing interests of some great corporation, as frequently happens in industrial centers, will have a different and more meager community background than a rural family that carries on where its forebears have lived for several generations. This lack of continuity in community background may be looked upon as an environmental influence or as a characteristic feature of the family. Army, navy, and various other professional employments also make difficult the building of normal community contacts for family life.

Many breadwinners work at night rather than by day. Their occupational demands become an influence upon the family, not only complicating household routine but also changing the association of parent and child and of husband and wife. The home must adopt a peculiar routine. Even the commuting of the family head who earns his living in the city but lives outside will act upon the family as an environmental influence that cannot be disregarded. One successful businessman who had to travel back and forth each working day finally changed his occupation to one less profitable because, as he said, he grew tired of having his children nearly always asleep when he was at home. He had discovered that familial adaptations can act as environmental influences upon the personal relationships within the home.

XIX. *The Evolution of Social Thought Concerning the Family*

THERE IS AN IMMENSE QUANTITY of social thinking that in one way or another is related to marriage and the family. This literature, broadly conceived, appears almost coextensive with rational social discussion. If, however, this mass is subjected to any degree of discriminating analysis, much of it must be discarded because it lacks originality or social significance. Any attempt to sort it out so as to bring together what seems to be most pertinent as intellectual background for the serious student of the family is likely to reveal personal interests, background, and bias. There are some contributions that no one would discard, for their importance would be universally recognized. In addition to these, there are many others that can rightly claim consideration but are excluded merely because of limitations of space. In the survey that is presented here an effort has been made to include, first, discussions of marriage and the family that have influenced thought and practice; and, second, those that, although they did not in any great degree move human sentiments or actions, are especially suggestive to the modern student of the family as sources of insight for those who now wrestle with the pressing problems of domestic experience.

In spite of the attention the family has always received in serious literature, it is amazing how incidental much of the discussion has been. The importance of the institution is recognized and proclaimed, but the consideration given it is as scanty as John Calvin's references in his theology to the scenery of Geneva, and for a similar reason. The reformer was too close to and familiar with the exceptional beauties of his native city, too

chained to his narrow purposes, for nature to awaken aesthetic sensitivity and appreciation. In like manner, the philosopher has taken the family too much for granted, and in his interpretation of man and the universe has turned his mind away from what, were he pressed for a decision, he would admit is the supremely important source of social continuity and substance.

When the writers who have recognized the meaning of the family for the individual and society are assembled, they are indeed a motley group, having in common only their interest in the domestic institution. If they could be gathered together in the flesh, what a violent and anarchistic assemblage they would make, each committed to his unique analysis of domestic experience! Of one thing we could be certain, there would be little agreement in their findings and no orderly development that would place them in relation to one another in a time sequence. This is likewise true as their contributions are reviewed in the following brief survey.

Religious leaders

Old Testament thinking. The Hebrew development of religious thinking was an evolution, and one that affected family life. The following quotations from the Old Testament illustrate the high regard given the family in the literature of the Jews.

KINSHIP: Ruth 1:16.

And Ruth said, Entreat me not to leave thee, and to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God.

LOVE: Song of Solomon 4:10-16.

How fair is thy love, my sister, my bride!
How much better is thy love than wine!
And the fragrance of thine oils than all manner of spices!
Thy lips, O my bride, drop as the honeycomb:

Honey and milk are under thy tongue;
And the smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon.
A garden shut up is my sister, my bride;
A spring shut up, a fountain sealed.
Thy shoots are an orchard of pomegranates, with precious fruits;
Henna with spikenard plants,
Spikenard and saffron,
Calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense;
Myrrh and aloes, with all the chief spices.
Thou art a fountain of gardens,
A well of living waters,
And flowing streams from Lebanon.

Awake, O north wind; and come, thou south;
Blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out.
Let my beloved come into his garden,
And eat his precious fruits.

Song of Solomon 5:1.

I am come into my garden, my sister, my bride:
I have gathered my myrrh with my spice;
I have eaten my honeycomb with my honey;
I have drunk my wine with my milk.
Eat, O friends;
Drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved.

THE GOOD WIFE: Proverbs 31:10-31.

A worthy woman who can find?
For her price is far above rubies.
The heart of her husband trusteth in her,
And he shall have no lack of gain.
She doeth him good and not evil
All the days of her life.
She seeketh wool and flax,
And worketh willingly with her hands.
She is like the merchant-ships;
She bringeth her bread from afar.
She riseth also while it is yet night,

And giveth food to her household,
And their task to her maidens.
She considereth a field, and buyeth it;
With the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard.
She girdeth her loins with strength,
And maketh strong her arms.
She perceiveth that her merchandise is profitable;
Her lamp goeth not out by night.
She layeth her hands to the distaff,
And her hands hold the spindle.
She stretcheth out her hand to the poor;
Yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy.
She is not afraid of the snow for her household;
For all her household are clothed with scarlet.
She maketh for herself carpets of tapestry;
Her clothing is fine linen and purple.
Her husband is known in the gates,
When he sitteth among the elders of the land.
She maketh linen garments and selleth them,
And delivereth girdles unto the merchant.
Strength and dignity are her clothing;
And she laugheth at the time to come.
She openeth her mouth with wisdom;
And the law of kindness is on her tongue.
She looketh well to the ways of her household,
And eateth not the bread of idleness.
Her children rise up, and call her blessed;
Her husband also, and he praiseth her, saying:
Many daughters have done worthily,
But thou excellest them all.
Grace is deceitful, and beauty is vain;
But a woman that feareth Jehovah, she shall be praised.
Give her of the fruit of her hands;
And let her works praise her in the gates.

WOMAN'S STATUS: Numbers 30.

And Moses spake unto the heads of the tribes of the children of Israel, saying, This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded. When a man voweth a vow unto Jehovah, or sweareth an oath to

bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth. Also when a woman voweth a vow unto Jehovah, and bindeth herself by a bond, being in her father's house, in her youth, and her father heareth her vow, and her bond wherewith she hath bound her soul, and her father holdeth his peace at her; then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand. But if her father disallow her in the day that he heareth, none of her vows, or of her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul, shall stand: and Jehovah will forgive her, because her father disallowed her.

And if she be married to a husband, while her vows are upon her, or the rash utterance of her lips, wherewith she hath bound her soul, and her husband hear it, and hold his peace at her in the day that he heareth it; then her vows shall stand, and her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand. But if her husband disallow her in the day that he heareth it, then he shall make void her vow which is upon her, and the rash utterance of her lips, wherewith she hath bound her soul: and Jehovah will forgive her.

But the vow of a widow, or of her that is divorced, even everything wherewith she hath bound her soul, shall stand against her. And if she vowed in her husband's house, or bound her soul by a bond with an oath, and her husband heard it, and held his peace at her, and disallowed her not; then all her vows shall stand, and every bond wherewith she bound her soul shall stand. But if her husband made them null and void in the day that he heard them, then whatsoever proceeded out of her lips concerning her vows, or concerning the bond of her soul, shall not stand: her husband hath made them void; and Jehovah will forgive her.

Every vow, and every binding oath to afflict the soul, her husband may establish it, or her husband may make it void. But if her husband altogether hold his peace at her from day to day, then he establisheth all her vows, or all her bonds, which are upon her: he hath established them, because he held his peace at her in the day that he heard them. But if he shall make them null and void after that he hath heard them, then he shall bear her iniquity. These are the statutes, which Jehovah commanded Moses, between a man and his wife, between a father and his daughter, being in her youth, in her father's house.

Jesus. The teaching of Jesus is of supreme importance in any attempt to trace the influence of Christianity as it appeared in the doctrines of his followers regarding marriage and the family. Here as elsewhere it is to be regretted that we have such a fragmentary insight. Perhaps our most impressive revelation of his attitude toward marriage is his attendance at the marriage at Cana in the report that has come down to us of the miracle of his changing water into wine. Matrimony not only had his approval; he also responded to its festivity. It is fortunate that this occurrence has been recorded, probably due to the miracle that became associated with it, since otherwise the fact that Jesus did not marry might have committed the Church to an asceticism greater than that which resulted from interpretations of the attitude of St. Paul.

The celibacy of Jesus was inherent in the career that he undertook. He demanded that his example be followed only in so far as it was necessary for any individual to renounce his domestic ties in order to join with those who were attempting to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. This principle has been insisted upon by all founders of religious movements and does not indicate hostility to the idea of marriage. Struggling as Jesus was in his attempt to plant securely his new religious conception, not only was marriage morally unthinkable but neither for him nor for any who joined with him could family ties be permitted to be a handicap. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." (St. Matthew 10:37.) Again he insists, using himself as an example, upon the subordination of family ties to the undertaking he and his followers had assumed. "It was told him, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. But he answered and said unto them, My mother and brethren are these that hear the word of God, and do it." (Luke 8:20-21.) Such teachings were not attempts to belittle domestic values; they insisted upon the superior claims of spiritual necessities in the militant beginning of Christianity.

It is significant that Jesus sets himself against the prevailing discrimination against women. In the most radical way possible, he insists that even the woman of sin be not set apart. (Luke 7:37-50.) In no way could Jesus have more greatly disturbed the sex conventions of his period than by insisting at another time that the first stone to be cast against a harlot be thrown by whosoever among the crowd was himself free from taint.

Possibly the most consequential of the sayings of Jesus as they concern marriage and the family was his declaration, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." (St. Matthew 19:9.) These words have led to great controversy due to sincere differences as to their meaning.[1] Strangely enough, they have been taken by the Church as legislation rather than as a principle. This use of his words is unique, and the emphasis it puts on the significance of a physical act in comparison with the spiritual meaning of a relationship seems contrary to the spirit that the adherents of Christianity have stressed in the other teachings of Jesus. Christian leaders in the past usually have committed themselves either to a denial of divorce or to the acceptance of it only in the case of an act of adultery. This has led in the latter case to the one exception in the insistence by the Church on the superior significance of spiritual over physical experience. Moral and spiritual disunion in marriage is refused recognition as grounds for divorce. This attitude is so contrary to the trend of Christian teaching that the orthodox stand of the Church regarding divorce has to an increasing number of Christian people appeared a cruel inconsistency.

St. Paul. The leadership of St. Paul, dominant in the Christian Church of the first century, has been maintained by his writings throughout the evolution of Christian thinking. This has meant that what he wrote regarding marriage and the family has had a profound influence on the practices and doc-

[1] Frank H. Norcross, *Christianity and Divorce.*

trines of the Church regarding marriage. The use that has been made of his words has tended to make marriage seem a necessary provision, a preferred means of dealing with the strength of human passion, and has established and perpetuated the notion of the inferiority of the woman as compared with the man. These ideas of Paul were extended and hardened into dogma by the Church Fathers. This has meant that we now read into the statements of Paul the meaning his words came to have as the early theology of the Church shaped itself.

Since the great missionary was confronted with the need of recognizing realistically the conditions of his time as he attempted to give his churches the guidance necessary to preserve them, on account of their weakness, from the perils that beset them, it is easy to forget the purpose of his writing and to charge him with responsibility for the later asceticism that found support in incidental statements, apparently expressed as personal opinion, which he had made regarding marriage. In any case, it seems clear that he was influenced in part by the belief that he held during a great part of his missionary period, that Christ was to reappear to the first generation of Christians.

Writing to the church at Corinth, he said, "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. . . . But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment. For I would that all men were even as I myself. . . . I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." (I Cor. 7:2-9.) Looking backward, it is hard to see how Paul could have safely given other counsel than that. He also had to recognize the social conventions in the relationships then existing between man and woman or endanger the future of the churches he had planted. His position in such matters was similar to that which he took regarding slavery. Nevertheless, the following words of his have greatly retarded the development of an equality relationship of men and women:

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. . . . Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. (I Cor. 11:7-9; 14:34.)

I desire therefore . . . In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve; and Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression: but she shall be saved through her childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety. (I Tim. 2:8-15.)

The basic attitude of St. Paul as he attempts to deal specifically with church practices as they have to do with the conventions pertaining to the relationship of men and women seems well expressed in his exhortation that "Ye may be blameless, harmless, the sons of God without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation among whom ye shine as lights in the world." (Phil. 2:15.)

The Church Fathers. Whatever may have been the premises and convictions of St. Paul, his assertions became the basis of a considerable ascetic development fostered during the formative period of Christianity by many of those who became leaders in the movement. The harshness and unwholesomeness of this stand are in sharp contrast to the spirit of Jesus as revealed in those teachings that have come down to us. These hard sayings, however, give us only one side of the influence of early Christianity upon the development of domestic standards and attitudes. Even Tertullian, who, writing in the third century, seems to have gone farthest in his asceticism, also declared, "We

do not indeed forbid the union of man and woman blessed by God as the seminary of the human race devised for the replenishment of the earth and the furnishing the world and therefore permitted, yet singly."[2] In answer to the criticism that his doctrine was destroying even the rightness of the single marriage, Tertullian writes, "And not without reason (if I am); inasmuch as it, too, consists of that which is the essence of fornication." At the end of the same discussion he says, ". . . not yet is the means through which she becomes a married woman any other than that through which withal (she becomes) an adulteress."[3] Jerome argues, "To show that virginity is natural while wedlock only follows guilt, what is born of wedlock is virgin flesh, and it gives back in fruit what in root it has lost." Again this writer of the fourth century exclaims, "I praise wedlock, I praise marriage, but it is because they give me virgins."[4] This extension of ideas found in the preachments of St. Paul became the source of dualistic teaching in the sex and domestic philosophy of Christianity as it dominated Europe.

Although asceticism clearly appears in the writings of prominent Church Fathers during the early centuries of Christianity, it is doubtful whether the student can gather the meaning of this from isolated citations, or that these even give a just impression of the attitude of the writers toward marriage and the family.[5] They were engaged in polemic writing in a period of great struggle, and words taken by themselves easily led to exaggeration. Tertullian, for example, who had urged his wife not to marry again because he felt that such a marriage was

[2] Willystine Goodsell, *A History of Marriage and the Family*, p. 161.

[3] *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 18, p. 14.

[4] Goodsell, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[5] The author has been startled to find that he has been recently charged with the statement that children are a liability to family stability, because of his assertion that there is a possibility of emotional tension between parents who differ regarding matters concerning their children, and with teaching that satisfactory sexual relations are not necessary to successful and well-adjusted unions, because of his declaration that sexual difficulties between husband and wife are not usually simply physical (Lewis M. Terman, *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*, p. 9), although both of these statements are contrary to his belief and teaching.

improper for a Christian, later with a surprising tolerance urged her if she did marry again to choose a Christian and not a pagan. Jerome's disparaging expressions concerning marriage were criticized by his contemporaries, who charged him with not having given any satisfactory explanation for his position.[6] It is this same Jerome who writes, "Be on your guard when you begin to modify your body by abstinence and fasting lest you imagine yourself to be perfect and a saint, for perfection does not consist in this virtue."[7] If this is all we had from him, we would think of him as an opponent or at least a critic of asceticism. In any case his harsh words are softened when we learn of his exceptional friendship with the two women from whom he drew inspiration, Paula and Eustochium.

The modern reader is apt to forget the positive purpose running through this early asceticism, the attempt of leaders in an intense social and spiritual conquest, literally a life-and-death struggle, to concentrate upon their chosen task. Failure to see this may hide from the reader the fact that their program is not unlike the decision of one who has given up all thought of marriage for the sake of a professional career or a social obligation but who recoils from a similar life-attitude when expressed by the Church Fathers, as something utterly unwholesome. The addition, in words often repellent to the modern ear, of a militant advocacy of nonmarriage on their part was evidence of their intense zeal for spiritual independence rather than of their hostility to marriage and parenthood.

St. Augustine (354-430). Aurelius Augustinus, commonly known as St. Augustine, who profoundly influenced the thinking of the Christian Church, writes regarding marriage, that the union of male and female for the purpose of procreation is the natural good of marriage. He, however, makes bad use of it who seeks to gratify lust rather than procure offspring.[8] Between the

[6] *Catholic Encyclopædia,* vol. 15, p. 345.
[7] *Ibid.,* vol. 1, p. 768.
[8] *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series,* vol. 5, pp. 251-271.

conjugal pair, as long as they live, the nuptial bond has a permanent obligation that can be canceled neither by separation nor by union with another. There is no true chastity, whether conjugal, or vidual, or virginal, except that that devotes itself to true faith. Even such embraces of husband and wife that have not procreation for their object but serve an overbearing concupiscence are permitted, so far as to be within range of forgiveness, though not prescribed by way of commandment: and the married pair are enjoined not to defraud one another, lest Satan should tempt them by reason of their incontinence. Continence is better than marriage, but marriage is better than fornication. The blessings of matrimony should be offspring, fidelity, and the sacramental bond. The three purposes of marriage are procreation, guarantee of chastity, and bond of union. The words, "Be fruitful and multiply," are not prophetic of sins to be condemned but a benediction upon the fertility of marriage. The connubial embrace, however, which marriage contracts point to as intended for the procreation of children, considered in itself simply and without any reference to fornication is good and right because although it is by reason of this body of death (which is unrenewed as yet by the resurrection) impracticable without a certain amount of bestial motion which puts human nature to the blush, yet the embrace is not after all a sin in itself when reason applies the concupiscence to a good end, and is not overmastered to evil. Jesus, in that he came to the marriage to which he was invited, wished, apart from the mystical significance, to assure us that marriage was his own institution. God instituted marriage; and as the union of man and wife is from God, so divorce is from the devil. But in the case of fornication it is lawful for a man to put away his wife because she first chose to be no longer wife in not preserving conjugal fidelity to her husband.[9]

Martin Luther (1483-1546). The attitude of Martin Luther toward marriage and the family, his practices and teachings, had the same dominant influence upon the domestic program of early

[9] *Ibid.*, vol. 7, p. 63.

Protestantism that his leadership possessed in the Reformation movement. The position he takes, however, is not always consistent nor in accord with later doctrines of the Protestant Churches. A dramatic and therefore the most positive of his contributions was his own marriage. Here also he reveals a change in attitude. At the beginning of his career as a reformer, although he approved marriage for others, he again and again exclaimed that it was not for him. June 13, 1525, he suddenly startled his followers by marrying Katharina von Bora, a former nun who had been brought up from childhood in the convent of Nintzpa near Grimma. She, then twenty-six years old, having taken her vows at the age of sixteen, had been helped to escape from the convent and had been under the protection of Luther.

This unexpected marriage led to a widespread criticism. Even some of his friends believed that he had given his cause a death-blow.[10] Luther was led to marry from mixed motives. Two influences were prominent. One was his recognition of the strength and normality of the impulse; the other was his readiness to attack and startle his opponents by an alliance that he knew would astound and shock them.

He has recorded his confession of the difficulty of the monk's career in his statement, "To remain righteous and unmarried is not the least of trials as those know well who have made the attempt." Even before he had broken with the Church, in a sermon on the wedding at Cana of Galilee, he exclaimed, "Marriage is the holiest estate, most great, most worthy, the noblest thing that ever was or can be—the union of divine and human nature in one flesh. So God and man are in Christ, and Christ and Christianity are in one body."[11] Again he writes, "Man was created by God for marriage." In contrast to the Catholics, who interpreted marriage as a mystery in the sacrament, Luther's position appears to have been that it was a wholesome, natural act of obedience by faith to the will of the Creator. This

[10] Julius Kostlin, *Life of Luther*, p. 330; Arthur C. McGiffert, *Martin Luther: The Man and His Work*, chap. XIX.

[11] G. E. Lenski, *Marriage in the Lutheran Church*, p. 115.

doctrine explains and somewhat lessens his cruel-sounding exclamation, "If the woman is worn out and should die in childbed, well enough!" He felt that even such a misfortune based upon faith was better than a long life without such a religious commitment and without the willingness to become a parent. Marriage should not only be grounded upon faith but should be expected to bring forth spiritual value and to bring to the believer confidence and strength. Marriage is not easy, but it represents a desirable discipline. Family life also brings its burden. Demands are placed upon the man, who needs to co-operate in the care of the infant. The lot of the woman is especially difficult because upon her falls the ordeal of pregnancy.

True marriage demands love. This to Luther was more than passion. It was a recognition of personal worth and was suggestive of the love of the believer for God. All of the emotions of the married are to be governed by love.

Parenthood is a natural consequence of marriage and should deepen and intensify the relationship of husband and wife. It carries responsibilities of the greatest importance that yield deep spiritual values. Parents are obligated not only to feed and clothe their offspring but also to teach them to know, love, and serve God. Parenthood is a spiritual and apostolic service through which the father ministers to his loved ones in the place of God and also becomes a form of divine revelation. The loyal home is a church, even a paradise, the parent in the spirit of a bishop ministering to his own children.

Luther was frequently asked to give advice to those who were troubled by personal problems in their marital relationship. To those who had entered the monastic life he writes that since man has created celibacy, man has the right to abolish it.[12] Luther's approval of the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse, a situation which now, when a modern divorce system prevails, could be handled legally, and his desire to keep it secret brought widespread condemnation from both Protestants and Catholics.

[12] Lenski, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

In his counseling, Luther seems to have been influenced by his belief that marriage is an antidote to a tyranny of impulse that otherwise would lead to lustful passion. He considers a woman married to an impotent man, unable or unwilling to present evidence of her situation to the court, free with or without the husband's consent to marry another.[13]

Although approving polygamy under exceptional circumstances, Luther holds to monogamy as the standard relationship.[14] He regards monasticism as unnatural and as a temptation to immorality. He saw no scriptural objection to a second or even sixth marriage. He regards marriage as almost always morally better than the single life. Although he shows in the general trend of his thinking an acceptance of the common belief of his time that woman is inferior to man, his insistence on the dignity of the married woman, the honor belonging to the wife and mother, contributed to a more liberal attitude toward the rights of women through such words as these regarding marriage:

> Therefore I have always taught that this estate be not despised nor held in disrepute, as is done by the blind world and our false spiritual guides; but that it be regarded according to God's Word, by which it is adorned and sanctified, so that it is not only placed on an equality with other conditions in life, but that it transcends them all, whether they be that of emperor, prince, bishop, or whatever they will. For both ecclesiastical and civil estates must humble themselves, and all must be found in this estate, as we shall hear. Therefore it is not a particular estate, but at the same time the most common and the most noble which pervades all Christendom, yea, which even extends throughout all the world.[15]

Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). Swedenborg's *Marital Love: Its Wise Delights,* which at first appeared in Latin in 1768, is not only a unique discussion of marriage and the problems of sex but also, taking into account its time and place and the back-

[13] H. E. Jacobs, tr., *Works of Martin Luther,* vol. 2, pp. 269, 270.
[14] E. L. Enders, *Luthers Briefe,* vol. 6, No. 1150, pp. 30-33.
[15] *Large Catechism,* p. 420.

ground of the author, is remarkable in its frankness, practicality, and liberality. It analyzes in detail well-ordered sexual adjustment as it may be realized in marriage and disordered sex life with its gradation of error and its perversions. Swedenborg's basic teaching appears in his assertion that the "marital tendency of one man to one woman is a jewel of human life and the repository of the Christian religion." [16] With this as his premise, he proceeds to deal not only with the conditions that make for the achievement of domestic happiness but also in a most searching manner with the vices that result from an undisciplined and unspiritual sexual experience. His comprehensiveness and realism are amazing when one remembers that the author, who had remained unmarried, was writing at the age of eighty.

Whatever the source of the insight which Swedenborg explained as coming from special revelation, his presentation makes profitable reading for the student of marriage. He covers so much ground that his teaching cannot be satisfactorily summarized. The following extracts do indicate the general drift of his thought and suggest the richness of the material, which is of course presented within the framework of his theological system.

Love for the sex is of the external or natural man and hence is common to all animals. In the human being, marital love is within love for the other sex like a gem in its matrix. Love for the opposite sex in the human being is not the origin, but the first stage, of marital love, and is like the external natural in which an internal spirit is implanted. When marital love has been added, love for the sex alters and becomes chaste love of the sex. Regarded in itself, true marital love is union of the souls of the man and woman, conjunction of their minds, and an effort after conjunction in bosom and so in the body. The states of this love are innocence, peace, tranquillity, inmost friendship, full trust, and the mutual desire of mind and heart to do each other every good; and growing out of all these,

[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 581.

blessedness, satisfaction, joy, pleasure, and in the external fruition of these, heavenly happiness. These can by no means be possessed except in a marriage of one man with one wife.[17] Spiritual coldness in marriage is disunion of souls and disjunction of minds; whence come indifference, discord, contempt, disgust, and aversion, which lead at length with many to separation from bed, chamber, and house.[18] His treatment of jealousy is a good example of his manner of writing and his skill of analysis:

1. Viewed in itself, zeal is as it were the fire of love blazing.
2. This blazing or flaming of love, which is zeal, is a spiritual blazing or flaming, arising from infestation of love and from attack on it.
3. A man's zeal is such as his love is, one thing, therefore, with the man whose love is good, and another with the man whose love is evil.
4. The zeal of a good love and the zeal of an evil love resemble each other in externals, but are utterly unlike in internals.
5. The zeal of a good love hides love and friendship in its internals, but the zeal of an evil love hides hatred and revenge in its internals.
6. The zeal of marital love is called jealousy.
7. Jealousy is like a blazing fire against those infesting the love of the partner, and like a horrid fear of losing that love.
8. Jealousy is spiritual with monogamists, and natural with polygamists.
9. In partners who love each other tenderly, jealousy is a right anxiety from sound reason lest marital love be sundered and thus perish.
10. In partners who do not love each other jealousy has a number of causes, arising with some from various kinds of mental illness.
11. Some feel no jealousy at all, which is also from various causes.
12. There is jealousy over mistresses, too, but not such as there is for wives.
13. Beasts and birds also feel jealousy.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 232.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 323.

14. Jealousy in men and husbands is different from jealousy in women and wives.[19]

Present Protestant thinking. Among the Protestant churches in the United States there is developing greater appreciation of the significance of the family and of the need of the churches' doing everything possible to conserve it. The following resolution, adopted by the Conference on Family Life[20] under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the International Council of Religious Education, and the National Council of Church Women, is representative of the growing attitude of Protestantism toward the family.

The values which the church and the family cherish and foster as greatest and most significant are diametrically opposed to those that dominate society today. Consequently, both family and church are little valued by society as productive cultural institutions, and both institutions have been decidedly crippled in their functioning.

Nevertheless, the principle most needed in the world today—fellow-feeling, love, community—depends upon the effective functioning of these two institutions, of the Christian church because it holds this to be the greatest Christian principle, and of the family because it is the chief germinative center of this principle.

Consequently, it is apparent that our present cultural crisis is a peculiarly severe crisis for both family and church, so severe that support of these two institutions and their functions calls for organized activity of a dynamically purposive and deeply intelligent sort. This calls for a reversal of the present church attitude towards the family, for now the church must foster, guide, and conserve the family as the chief germinative center of the Christian principle which is so largely ignored and belittled in present-day civilization. The church must reverse its expectation of the family, no longer thinking of it chiefly as obligated to support the church, but thinking of the conservation of the family as the chief and most sound way to establish the Kingdom of God on this earth. If the family is to be saved, and hence if there is to be generated sufficient fellow-

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 476-477.
[20] Buffalo, December 1938.

feeling, community, love, to save society from threatened chaos, the church must become in spirit and in truth a fellowship of families, with genuine concern for the welfare and fulfillment of the family on the highest level possible. That is, the church must lose itself in this great cause in order to fully find itself, for families make up the membership of the church, and both family and church when normally functioning seek to promote human fulfillment on the highest level.

Present Roman Catholic thinking. Roman Catholic thinking is authoritatively expressed by Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical Letter to the Church Hierarchy in the United States.[21] Regarding the family, he wrote in part the following:

What can there be on earth more serene and joyful than the Christian family? Taking its origin at the altar of the Lord, where love has been proclaimed a holy and indissoluble bond, the Christian family in the same love, nourished by supernal grace, is consolidated and receives increase. There is "marriage honorable in all and the nuptial bed undefiled" [cf. Hebrews 13, 4]; Tranquil walls resound with no quarreling voices nor do they witness the secret martyrdom which comes when hidden infidelity is laid bare; unquestioning trust turns aside the slings of suspicion; sorrow is assuaged and joy is heightened by mutual affection.

Within those sacred precincts children are considered not heavy burdens but sweet pledges of love; no reprehensible motive of convenience, no seeking after sterile pleasure bring about the frustration of the gift of life nor cause to fall into disuse the sweet names of brother and sister.

With what solicitude do the parents take care that the children not only grow in physical vigor, but also that, following in the footsteps of their forbears whose memory is often recalled to them, they may shine with the light which profession of the pure faith and moral goodness impart to them. Moved by the numerous benefits received, such children consider it their paramount duty to honor their parents, to be attentive to their desires, to be the staff of their old age, to rejoice their gray hairs with an affection which,

[21] November 11, 1939.

unquenched by death, will be made more glorious and more complete in the mansion of heaven.

The members of the Christian family, neither querulous in adversity nor ungrateful in prosperity, are ever filled with confidence in God, to whose sway they yield willing obedience, in whose will they acquiesce and upon whose help they wait not in vain.

That the family may be established and maintained according to the wise teachings of the gospel, therefore the faithful should be frequently exhorted by those who have the directive and teaching functions in the churches, and these are to strive with unremitting care to present to the Lord a perfect people. For the same reason it is also supremely necessary to see to it that the dogma of the unity and indissolubility of matrimony is known in all its religious importance and sacredly respected by those who are to marry.

That this capital point of Catholic doctrine is of great value for the solidity of the family structure, for the progress and prosperity of civil society, for the healthy life of the people and for civilization that its light may not be false is a fact recognized even by no small number of men who though estranged from the faith are entitled to respect for their political acumen.

Oh! If only your country had come to know from the experience of others rather than from examples at home of the accumulation of ills which derive from the plague of divorce! Let reverence for religion, let fidelity toward the great American people counsel energetic action that this disease, alas so widespread, may be cured by extirpation.

The consequences of this evil have been thus described by Pope Leo XIII in words whose truth is incisive: "Because of divorce, the nuptial contract becomes subject to fickle whim; affection is weakened; pernicious incentives are given to conjugal infidelity; the care and education of offspring are harmed; easy opportunity is afforded for the breaking up of homes; the seeds of discord are sown among families; the dignity of woman is lessened and brought down and she runs the risk of being deserted after she has served her husband as an instrument of pleasure.

"And since it is true that for the ruination of the family and the undermining of the State nothing is so powerful as the corruption

of morals, it is easy to see that divorce is of the greatest harm to the prosperity of families and of states." [Encyclical Letter Arcanum.]

The philosophers

Confucius (550 or 551-476 B.C.). The supreme development of the family as the major social institution is found among the Chinese. This emphasis upon the family was greatly influenced by the classic literature, especially the writings of Confucius and Mencius. Their basic teaching is the importance of the domestic virtues, particularly family loyalty and piety. The following brief quotations from Confucius, and those that follow under Mencius, are representative of the attitude these two philosophers take toward the importance of the family.

What is meant by "The regulation of one's family depends on the cultivation of his person," is this:—Men are partial where they feel affection and love; partial where they despise and dislike; partial where they stand in awe and reverence; partial where they feel sorrow and compassion; partial where they are arrogant and rude. Thus it is that there are few men in the world, who love, and at the same time know the bad qualities of *the object of their love*, or who hate, and yet know the excellences of the *object of their hatred.*

Hence it is said, in the common adage, "A man does not know the wickedness of his son; he does not know the richness of his growing corn."

This is what is meant by saying that if the person be not cultivated, a man cannot regulate his family.

What is meant by "In order rightly to govern his State, it is necessary first to regulate his family," is this:—It is not possible for one to teach others, while he cannot teach his own family. Therefore, the ruler, without going beyond his family, completes the lessons for the State. There is filial piety:—therewith the sovereign should be served. There is fraternal submission:—therewith elders and superiors should be served. There is kindness:—therewith the multitude should be treated.[22]

[22] *The Great Learning*, VIII and IX.

The duties of universal obligation are five, and the virtues wherewith they are practised are three. The duties are those between sovereign and minister, between father and son, between husband and wife, between elder brother and younger, and those belonging to the intercourse of friends. Those five are the duties of universal obligation. Knowledge, magnanimity, and energy, these three are the virtues universally binding. And the means by which they carry *the duties* into practice is singleness.[23]

Mencius (372-289 B. C.).

The desire of the child is towards his father and mother. When he becomes conscious of the attractions of beauty, his desire is towards young and beautiful women. When he comes to have a wife and children, his desire is towards them. When he obtains office, his desire is towards his sovereign:—if he cannot get the regards of his sovereign, he burns within. *But* the man of great filial piety, to the end of his life, has his desire towards his parents. In the great Shun I see the case of one whose desire of fifty years was towards them.[24]

Wan Chang asked *Mencius*, saying, "It is said in the Book of Poetry,

> 'In marrying a wife, how ought a man to proceed?
> He must inform his parents.'

If the rule be indeed as here expressed, no man ought to have illustrated it so well as Shun. How was it that Shun's marriage took place without his informing *his parents*?" Mencius replied, "If he had informed them, he would not have been able to marry. That male and female should dwell together, is the greatest of human relations. . . ."[25]

Plato (427-507 B.C.).[26] Plato approaches the discussion of marriage and the family in his *Republic* with a frank admission that he is reluctant to take up the subject lest his program for

[23] *The Doctrine of the Mean*, XX, 8.
[24] *Wan Chang*, I, 5.
[25] *Ibid.*, II, 1.
[26] Benjamin Jowett, tr., *Plato*, pp. 138-156.

the relationship of the sexes may make his whole scheme seem "to be a dream only." He agrees with his questioners that the right or wrong management of matters that concern the family will have a great and paramount influence on the state for good or for evil. It is necessary first of all to decide whether or not men and women should have the same duties and therefore the same nurture and education. If the male and female sex radically differ in their fitness for any art or pursuit, their life-career should be unlike. But if their difference consists merely in the fact that women bear and men beget children, this does not justify assigning them to separate pursuits even though the male on the whole is superior to the female. Although some women are in many things superior to many men, they are on the whole inferior. The same distinction between the ability of individual women should be recognized as that which among men has led to their social classification. As the male guardians are the best of the citizens, so should their wives be the best of women.

Plato does not think there can be any basis for argument regarding the great advantage of having wives and children in common. The possibility of such an arrangement is, however, something that will be very much disputed. The task of building a communal family falls upon the rulers of the state as legislators. Having selected the men for their various roles they must do the same for the women. The choice must as far as possible be that of like with like; they must live in common houses, and eat together at common meals. No one will have anything especially his or her own. The men and women will be brought up together from childhood and will associate in gymnastic exercises. This will mean that they will be drawn by necessity of their natures to have intercourse with each other, the kind of necessity known to lovers. In this mating, the principle of eugenics must always be recognized, and the best must be mated only with the best, and the inferior with the inferior as seldom as possible. The offspring coming from the first union should be raised, but not that of the other. In order, however, to prevent rebellion, the rulers must maintain this eugenic program through

secret manipulation. Their task must be to bring together the right brides and bridegrooms in the attempt to maintain the desired amount of population, taking into account the effects of wars and diseases.

In order to reward the superior male youth with greater facilities for intercourse with women, in addition to other honors and advantages, the rulers must be equal to inventing some method of choosing mates by lots in such a way that the worthy may be fortunate and the others will be led to accuse their ill luck rather than the rulers for their disadvantage. The offspring of the inferior and the deformed that may be born to the superior will be put away in some mysterious unknown place. The greatest care will be taken that no mother shall recognize her own child. It will also be necessary not to allow the nursing period to be lengthened unduly, or to become a burden to the mother. She will be saved from getting up at night or from other troublesome responsibilities by the nurses whose business it will be to save the superior mothers from the hardships of child care.

A woman may begin to bear children to the State at twenty years of age and continue until forty. The man should begin to be a father at twenty-five and cease begetting children at fifty-five. Incestuous relationships are defined as the mating of a man with his daughter, or his daughter's daughter, his mother or his mother's mother. A similar prohibition in the case of the woman prevents her marriage with her son, or father, or son's son, or father's father. But how are the parents to know who are their offspring? They will never know, but dating from the day of the hymeneal, the bridegroom who has been married will call all males who are born from the seventh to the tenth month afterward his sons, and their children, his grandchildren. Similarly, female children born during the period will be considered his daughters, and their children, his granddaughters. The males and females of this age level will consider themselves brothers and sisters and will not intermarry unless they happen to be chosen by lot and receive the sanction of the Pythian oracle.

The community of families is necessary to make possible the community of property. It will prevent any man from gathering acquisitions which he will think of as belonging to himself and to be carried into a separate house of his own where he has a separate wife and child and pleasures and pains that are his only. This program will mean that all the people will work together for common ends and that they will be free from the quarrels that come through money, children, and relatives.

Plato discusses the significance of love in *Phædras* and especially in the *Symposium.* The latter looks at love from so many different points of view and is so flooded with a diversity of ideas that the reader is tempted to stress whatever makes personal appeal. The central theme is the searching of the soul through love for a good which it seeks but does not possess. A minor notion which has always interested students of marriage is the theory that the sexes represent a severance, and that each seeks the other because in union the man and the woman cease to be a part and become one whole.

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.).[27] "How much better it is to be the real cousin of somebody than to be a son after Plato's fashion!" remarks Aristotle. Moreover, such a scheme as Plato's would not always prevent recognition of relationships since frequently there would be hereditary likeness between parents and children and brothers and sisters. Instead of establishing the unity of the State, it would be the very opposite that will really happen if women and children are held in common. Love will be watery and there will be no genuine affection between parent and child. Two qualities necessary for regard and affection—that the thing is your own and that you love it—will be absent. The transferring of children from lower ranks to that of their guardians or the reverse will be difficult to carry out and will lead to all sorts of evils since there will be no restraint of impulse due to feelings of consanguinity.

It is foolish also to attempt to build a family system with the men and women following the same pursuits. It is useless to

[27] Benjamin Jowett, tr., *The Politics of Aristotle,* pp. 25-27.

argue from the analogy of animals since they do not have to manage a household.

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.). Although the Romans in their earlier period built a strong domestic life centering about the father, and in their later history brought the legal status of the woman to its highest point in the ancient world, we do not find in their literature the serious interest in the theory of the family that is expressed by Plato and Aristotle. Examples of Roman thinking are the writings of Cicero and Aurelius.

Cicero argued that since the powerful instinct that leads to reproduction is common to all living things, marriage is the seed of society. Marriage developed from the coming of children and expresses itself in the unity and common interest of the home. This makes the home also a source of society. Homes are the seedbed of social life. Through people being housed under one roof and by the extension of relationships through intermarriage, we have the establishment of associations that bind men together in good will and affection. This unity is furthered by the possession of the same ancestral relics, the same worship, and the same family tomb. Unity in plurality is achieved.[28]

Marcus Aurelius (121-180 A.D.).[29]

To the gods I am indebted for having good grandfathers, good parents, a good sister, good teachers, good associates, good kinsmen and friends, nearly everything good. Further, I owe it to the gods that I was not hurried into any offence against any of them, though I had a disposition which, if opportunity had offered, might have led me to do something of this kind; but, through their favour, there never was such a concurrence of circumstances as put me to the trial. Further, I am thankful to the gods that I was not longer brought up with my grandfather's concubine, and that I preserved the flower of my youth, and that I did not make proof of my virility before the proper season, but even deferred the time; that I was subjected to a ruler and a father who was able to take away all pride from me, and to bring me to the knowledge that it is

[28] *De Officiis*, I, p. 17.
[29] *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*, 17.

possible for a man to live in a palace without wanting either guards or embroidered dresses, or torches and statues, and suchlike show; but it is in such a man's power to bring himself very near to the fashion of a private person, without being for this reason either meaner in thought, or more remiss in action, with respect to the things which must be done for the public interest in a manner that befits a ruler. I thank the gods for giving me such a brother, who was able by his moral character to rouse me to vigilance over myself, and who, at the same time pleased me by his respect and affection; that my children have not been stupid nor deformed in body. . . .

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778).[30] Rousseau, whose words begat such practical political consequences both in Europe and America, dealt with marriage and the family incidentally, and chiefly in his educational romance, *Émile. La Nouvelle Héloïse* is an attack upon passion as a basis for happiness in marriage. Social convention provided a better way to human satisfaction. But his more significant contribution to thought about the family appears in *Émile,* as is demonstrated by the fact that it has been called "The Gospel of Childhood." He pleads for greater recognition of the importance of the function of the parents in the development of the child. As the real nurse of the child is the mother, the real preceptor is the father. There is no more charming picture of fellowship than true family life, but when it ceases there is an end to the contributions to life that should come from the home. He who is unwilling to fulfill the duties of a father has no right to become a parent. Marriage is a contract made with nature as well as between the husband and wife, and therefore all children that are born to the home, whatever their condition, should have equal share without partiality. The education of man begins at his birth. The first tears of children are prayers, but unless we are on our guard they soon become orders. Children need our aid, but they should be given only that which is actually useful. Their caprice or unreasonable desires should not be indulged. The only way to prevent or to

[30] William H. Payne, tr., *Rousseau's Émile,* pp. 15-48.

cure the crying of children who are in need of nothing is to pay no attention to what they do. There is an excess of severity and an excess of indulgence; and both are to be equally avoided.

Just as Rousseau's attitude toward the family is revealed in the admonitions he makes regarding the young child, so his concept of marriage appears chiefly in his discussion of Émile's adolescence.

In the union of the sexes each contributes equally toward the common end, but not in the same way. Hence arises the first assignable difference among their moral relations. One must be active and strong, the other passive and weak. One must needs have power and will, while it suffices that the other have little power of resistance.

This principle once established, it follows that woman is especially constituted to please man. If man ought to please her in turn, the necessity for it is less direct. His merit lies in his power; he pleases simply because he is strong. I grant that this is not the law of love, but it is the law of Nature, which is anterior even to love.[31]

. . . Thus the whole education of women ought to be relative to men. To please them, to be useful to them, to make themselves loved and honored by them, to educate them when young, to care for them when grown, to counsel them, to console them, and to make life agreeable and sweet to them—these are the duties of women at all times, and what should be taught them from their infancy.[32]

. . . Mutual inclination ought to be their first bond. Their eyes and their hearts ought to be their first guides. . . . This is the law of nature, which nothing can abrogate; and those who have obstructed its action by so many civil laws, have had more regard for apparent order than for the happiness of marriage and the morals of citizens.[33]

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 260.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 263.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 299.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804).[34] The significant teaching of Kant as related to the family appears in his *Lecture-Notes on Pedagogy*. Although Rousseau is not the source of his ideas, Kant was greatly influenced by the *Émile*. The story goes that while he was reading the book, he gave up his daily walks that had become as well established in his habit-life as the heartbeat in his body. Although Kant recognizes the importance of the parent in the life of the child, he is critical of domestic education which he believes not only brings out family faults but also fosters them. The child must be freed from the idea, which he gets from the parental home, that his desires can be satisfied as by magic without effort. Unless this life-handicap is removed, the child remains a child throughout his entire life. Both sexes must be educated and disciplined, but man needs this more than woman because of his position in society. Until we know more about feminine nature, it is best to leave the education of the girl to her mother. Woman requires much less training and education than man. What she needs is not instruction but guidance. Honor is her greatest virtue, domesticity her merit. Man's honor consists in his own estimation of himself; woman's honor, in the judgment of others.

A man marries according to his own judgment; a woman does not marry against her parents' wishes. The first inequality is that of a man and his child, the second that of a man and a woman. The man regards it as an obligation, since he is strong and they are weak, not to sacrifice anything to them.

Otto Weininger (1880-1903).[35] It is doubtful whether any theory regarding the differences between male and female as they affect domestic theory has ever been stated in a more exaggerated and repellent manner than by Otto Weininger in his highly original discussion, *Sex and Character*. It has been suggested as explanation that the author was familiar with only two types of women—his mother, and prostitutes. Weininger states

[34] Martin G. Brumbaugh, "Lecture-Notes on Pedagogy," *Kant's Educational Theory*, pp. 129-235.

[35] *Sex and Character*, Sixth Edition, pp. 29-348.

that his discussion is not one of details but of principles in the attempt to bring out fully the contrast between man and woman. He is influenced, he declares, chiefly by Plato, Kant, and Christianity. For true sexual union, he insists, it is necessary that a complete male and a complete female come together, even though in different cases the maleness and femaleness are distributed between two individuals in different proportions. The more femaleness a woman possesses, the less will she understand a man; and the sexual characters of a man will have the greater influence on her. There are plenty of differences among women, but every man in his life becomes intimate only with a group of women defined by his own constitution, and so naturally he finds them much alike. For the same reason, women insist that all men are alike. This narrow view of men due to subjective selection is displayed by most of the leaders of the women's rights movement. The crusade for women's emancipation is not something new, as is generally assumed, but has had duplication in both ancient and medieval history. The contemporary movement enlists not the true woman but the masculine type of woman who misinterprets her own character and the motives that are behind her demand.

There is no difference in the total sexual impulses of the sexes. The woman is devoted wholly to sexual matters, that is, to begetting and reproduction. Her relation to her husband and children completes her life, while, in contrast, the male is something more than sexual. It is here rather than in the relative strength of the sexual impulses that the real difference between men and women exists. Woman is only sexual; man is partly sexual. The sex life of the male is limited in area, strongly localized; while in the case of the woman it is diffused over her whole body so that stimulation may take place from almost any part of it. Woman has no consciousness of genius except as manifested in one particular individual to whose personality she responds, while man on the contrary has a deep capacity for realizing it. As a consequence, woman borrows a kind of imperfect consciousness from man. She has an unconscious life, man a

conscious life, and genius the most conscious life. The absolute female has no ego, man has everything within him. He can even become like women. The woman, however, although she can take on masculine traits, can never be anything else than fundamentally a female. Therefore, although women may show undoubted traits of genius, there never has been and can never be a female genius.

The making of judgments is a masculine trait, and is so recognized by the woman. Although women are credited with being morally superior to men, they are in fact nonmoral, their moral sense being completely absent. Woman's ability to nurse is not a proof of sympathy but of the lack of a sensibility that in the case of a man makes the sight of suffering too painful to be endured. Women have no faculty for affairs of state, lacking social inclination. The family itself is not really a social structure, it is essentially unsocial. Men who give up their clubs and societies because of marriage soon rejoin them. There are two types of women—the mother and the prostitute. The latter group is not limited to those who turn to commercial prostitution as a means of livelihood, but includes also many so-called respectable girls and married women.

The absolute prostitute thinks only of the man; the absolute mother, only of the child. The absolute mother can become a mother by any man. She is interested in children and ready to accept any promising candidate for matrimony whom she meets, if he satisfies her parents and relatives. The absolute prostitute, on the other hand, dislikes children. Her one desire is to please all men. There is no wife who has not been untrue to her husband in thought, yet no woman reproaches herself for this because her pledges are made lightly and without full consciousness of what she does. Maternal love never rests on moral grounds, as one can realize by asking whether, had he been an entirely different person, his mother would have loved him less. Since sexual union leads the man to regard the woman as a thing and to despise her the moment coitus is over, sexual union can have no place in the ideals of mankind. The education of woman

must be taken out of the hands of women; the education of mankind must be taken out of the hands of mothers. This is the first step toward placing woman in a relation to the ideal of mankind which since the beginning she has done more than anything else to hinder.

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860). Among the philosophers of the first rank, Schopenhauer stands next to Plato in the interest he takes in the problem of mating. This led him to expound his theory of marriage, which is a specific offshoot of his thesis, "the will to live." First of all, he remarks on the strangeness of the neglect of the love of the sexes by the philosophers. Naturally one would expect that a matter that plays so large a part in human life—a constant theme of the poets and dramatists—would be dealt with seriously by those who assume the task of the philosophic interpretation of human experience.[36] He begins his analysis with an assertion that now has a Freudian sound, that "all love, however ethereally it may bear itself, is rooted in the sexual impulse alone, nay, it absolutely is only a more definitely determined, specialized, and indeed in the strictest sense, individualized sexual impulse."

This impulse that plays so important a part and so constantly brings disturbance and confusion in the well-regulated life of man is no trifle, because it is fundamentally nothing less than the determining of the composition of the next generation, and not only leads to the existence of these future persons but also decides their characteristics. In this mating impulse "the will of the individual appears at a higher power as the will of the species." As the impulse appears generalized in consciousness, it is in itself simply the will to live; when, however, it is directed toward some definite member of the opposite sex, it is in itself the will to live as a definitely determined individual. This is not the meaning of the experience as it is known to consciousness, for nature requires the strategem of concealment to attain its ends. The two individuals captivated by a mutual attraction

[36] R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp, tr., Arthur Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Idea,* vol. 3, pp. 338-361.

feel the longing for an actual union and fusing together into a single being in order to live on only as this; and this longing receives its fulfillment in the child which is produced by them and in whom the qualities transmitted by them both, fused and united into one being, live on. He insists also that aversion between a man and a woman is a sign that they could produce as offspring only a badly organized, in itself inharmonious and unhappy, being.

Human mating and reproduction are not left to the uncertainties of the recognition and appeal of the social purpose they represent. Instead, human nature is driven by a strong passion which leads the individual to believe that he is taking trouble and making sacrifices for his own pleasure, while in fact he is serving to perpetuate his species. As a consequence, the lover will experience a marvelous disillusion after he has obtained his pleasure, and will wonder why what was so longingly desired accomplishes nothing more than every other sexual satisfaction. Thus man shares with the animals an instinctive pressure, subjectively experienced, a product of physiological processes, which functions as a kind of illusion. In its operation, however, there is a distinction between a man and a woman. The first is inclined to inconstancy; the second, to constancy. Man's love sinks from the moment it has received satisfaction. Other women charm him more than the one he has already possessed; he longs for variety. On the contrary, woman's love increases. This difference is in accord with the aim of nature to obtain the greatest possible increase of the species. The man can beget over a hundred children a year, while the woman, aside from multiple births, can bring forth only one offspring. Faithfulness, therefore, in man is artificial, while in the woman it is natural, and therefore her adultery is much less pardonable than that on the part of man—both objectively on account of the consequences, and also subjectively on account of its unnaturalness.

The intensity of love increases with its individualization because the tendency in mating is for each person to become

specially and perfectly the completion or supplement of the other. This leads each to desire the other exclusively. This mutual love fulfillment is above mere ignoble sex impulse because it possesses a quality-aspect bringing an intensity that can reach so high a degree that without its satisfaction all the good things in the world, even life itself, lose their value. It is an unparalleled illusion since it impels the lover to give up all the good things of this world to enjoy the possession of the other, who can really give nothing more than any other sexual partner. It represents a metaphysical desire of the will that primarily shows itself in no other sphere of action in the series of existences than in the hearts of the future parents who are seized with this ardent longing which they imagine to be only their own desire. The satisfaction of passion also leads oftener to unhappiness than to happiness, for its demands frequently conflict so much with the personal welfare that they undermine it. Love marriages accordingly as a rule turn out unhappily. They advance the welfare of the coming generation at the expense of the present.

Marriages for ulterior motives, on the contrary, sacrifice the species for the satisfaction of the individual. Indeed, happy marriages are well known to be rare because it lies in the nature of the experience that its chief interest is not the present, but the coming generation. Schopenhauer, however, recognizes the possibility of a different sort of fellowship, which he believes possible only when sexual love is extinguished through satisfactions and friendship replaces it.

The evolutionists

Charles Darwin (1809-1882). Darwin, who supplanted the previous nebulous intimations of evolution with a definite theory, was only incidentally concerned with human marriage and domestic experience, although one of his major interests was the operation of sexual selection in the development of both animal and human characteristics. The secondary characters of each sex, he says, lie dormant or latent in the opposite sex, ready to be

evolved under peculiar circumstances.[37] Woman, he states in his summary of sexual selection as it has affected the human species, differs from man in greater tenderness and less selfishness, which he believes is to be explained by her maternal instincts and her expression of these in the care of offspring. Man, in contrast, has been influenced by his competition with other males, giving him a love of rivalry which breeds ambition and easily passes into selfishness. Intellectually man attains higher eminence in anything he undertakes than does woman. He believes that although men no longer fight for their females, the fact that they must undergo a severe struggle to establish themselves will tend to maintain or even increase their mental powers, and this necessity is the cause of the present inequality between the sexes.[38] Thus Darwin, in spite of his stress of the importance of human mating, and of the moral obligation resting upon those who are defective in mind and body or destined to poverty not to marry, by implication commits himself to the theory that, although domestic activity is conserving and stimulates social sympathy, it is more instinctive and less conducive to intellectual development than the aggressive and as a rule predatory career of the male. This interpretation rests upon his emphasis of primitive experience, animal as well as human, as he sees it bringing forth through the processes of natural and sexual selection the modern man and woman. Naturally the question arises, how Darwin would evaluate contemporary social teaching leading to an emphasis upon the obligation of the mother to develop intelligence, discrimination, and self-restraint as well as sympathy in her formative contacts with her offspring, while the man in the great majority of income-bringing occupations is relegated to repetitious, machine-like, and largely supervised, activity.

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). Spencer[39] applied the doctrine of evolution throughout his attempts at a complete system of human thought. Part III of his *Synthetic Philosophy* is devoted

[37] *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication,* vol. 2, p. 27.
[38] *The Descent of Man,* pp. 576, 578.
[39] *Synthetic Philosophy,* vol. 1, Part II, pp. 720-772.

to a discussion of domestic institutions. It is the business of the family to protect the helpless, useless infant, who requires less attention as his self-preservation increasingly develops. When he enters the battle of life, he deals with a contrary system. Now reward, in contrast with parental policy, comes in proportion to his value. This means that there is a cardinal distinction between the ethics of the family and the ethics of the State. The welfare of the child is assured by yearnings of natural affection to which are added motives in the parents, partly personal and partly social, which in addition to their influence upon the security of the child initiate differences in status between children of opposite sex. The family, a product of the law of evolution, reflects in the forms it takes differences of social culture, and there is every reason to suppose that this will continue to be true on account of the effect of superior and inferior habitat.

The monogamic form of sexual relations is manifestly the ultimate form, and any changes that may occur are certain to be in completing and extending it. As this lifting of the standards of monogamy proceeds, public sentiment is likely to insist that the legal bond shall not be maintained if the natural bond ceases. This emphasis on affection will tend to liberalize the social attitude toward divorce. The development of the higher sentiments, however, with the increase of altruism, will tend to decrease domestic dissension, so that although social change will facilitate divorces, under certain conditions it will also discourage their appearance. With the decline of militancy, the rise of industrialism, the decrease of compulsory co-operation, and the increase of voluntary co-operation leading to greater regard of personal rights and sympathetic regard of these same rights as possessed by others, there will be a lessening of the political and domestic disabilities of women and a further approach toward an equality between the sexes, so that the only difference that shall remain between men and women will be such as the organic constitution enforces. Progress demands a mental and physical culture carried on by parents to an extent now rarely attempted. The bond which holds the family together, the care of offspring

by parents, is the one which has most room for increase. It is here that we find the resource of domestic evolution.

Spencer's *Education*[40] makes painful reading to anyone who faces the fact that the orthodox school programs and practices have not as yet caught up with the author's thinking. In his indictment of the educational backwardness of his day in the field of marriage and the family, Spencer states his conviction that domestic relationship offers an almost virgin opportunity for the utilization of intelligence as a means of advancing social welfare. He says that if evidence of our instruction should descend to some remote future, an antiquary of that period would suppose that it was material used for the training of celibates. The need of training for indirect self-preservation, that is, the preparation of the parents for the sake of the child, stands second only to instruction as to how to live, self-preservation, for we must conclude that the welfare of the family underlies the welfare of society. Thus, looking forward in contrast with Darwin, Spencer selects the family, the parent-child relationship, as the most promising opening for the investment of intelligence in any effort to advance human welfare.

Henry Drummond (1851-1897).[41] This Scottish writer approached the Darwinian hypothesis with religious interest and a biological background. He was repelled by the emphasis on competitive struggle given by Thomas Huxley's interpretation of Darwin's doctrine and wrote the Lowell lectures on *The Ascent of Man.* Drummond thought there were two principal functions working in evolution: first, the struggle for life based upon the self-regarding interest; second, the other-regarding function. One leads to individualism; the other to altruism. This struggle for the life of others has made possible the true life of man, which is lived not in the body nor in the intellect but in the warm world of the affections. Sex difference affords a mutual relation of male and female.

[40] *Op. cit.*, pp. 15-55.
[41] *The Ascent of Man*, pp. 19, 244, 316.

. . . This much, at least, Sex has done for the world—it has abolished the numeral *one*. Observe, it has not simply discouraged the existence of one; it has abolished the existence of one. The solitary animal must die, and can leave no successor. Unsociableness, therefore, is banished out of the world; it has become the very condition of continued existence that there should always be a family group, or at least pair. The determination of Nature to lay the foundation stone of corporate national life at this point, and to embed Sociability forever in the constitution of humanity, is only obvious when we reflect with what extraordinary thoroughness this Evolution of Sex was carried out. There is no instance in Nature of Division of Labor being brought to such extreme specialization. The two sexes were not only set apart to perform different halves of the same function, but each so entirely lost the power of performing the whole function that even with so great a thing at stake as the continuance of the species *one* could not discharge it. Association, combination, mutual help, fellowship, affection—things on which all material and moral progress would ultimately turn—were thus forced upon the world at the bayonet's point.

Motherhood, in which the principle of other-regard was inherent, led to the family, reinforced as it was in time by the development of fatherhood.

. . . Henceforth affection becomes a power in the world; and whatever physiological adjustments continue to go on beneath the surface, the most attached families will have a better chance of surviving and of transmitting their moral characteristics to succeeding generations. The completion of the arch of Family Life forms one of the great, if not the greatest of the landmarks of history. If the crowning work of Organic Evolution is the Mammalia; the consummation of the Mammalia is the Family. Physically, psychically, ethically, the Family is the masterpiece of Evolution. The creation of Evolution, it was destined to become the most active instrument and ally which Evolution has ever had. For what is its evolutionary significance? It is the generator and the repository of the forces which alone can carry out the social and moral progress of the world. . . .

John Fiske (1842-1901).[42] John Fiske, the American exponent of Spencerian evolution, regarded the uniting of men and women in family groups forming comparatively permanent organizations as a break in the struggle for existence and the establishing of a new era in the progress of life upon the earth's surface. A new type of social changes resulted, slow at first but at last moving with a rapidity which will slacken only as human progress approaches its goal. Thus the family occupies the supreme place in the changes which have brought forth the all-important contrast, not between other primates extinct and contemporary, but between civilized man and primitive man. The permanent family provided the germ of society.

Fiske believed the prolonged helplessness of the offspring kept the parents together for longer and longer periods in successive epochs, until at last the association was so long that the older children were growing mature while the younger ones still required protection, and thereby family relations began to be permanent. Natural selection would have gone on forever improving the breed of the highest animals in many ways, but never unaided could it have brought forth civilization or provided man with those peculiar attributes which distinguish him from the animals. In addition to the contributions of natural selection there was need of other influences. Supremely important among these was the gradual lengthening of babyhood. It was infancy that made possible an education that carried adaptation beyond the possibilities of instincts. The opportunity of the long period of helplessness belonging to the human infant provided a plasticity which was an open door for the entrance of the capacity for progress. There came a time in the development of what was destined to be human evolution when a larger and better brain was transmitted, with the rest of the body changing little, and these neural resources furnished the capacity for more complex activities that could be brought into expression during the mother-child relationship. This not only explains the

[42] *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, vol. 4, pp. 59-134; *Excursions of an Evolutionist*, pp. 307-319.

achievement of human evolution, but also gives man "the boundless possibilities of a higher and grander humanity than has yet been seen upon the earth."

The anthropologists

Sir Henry Maine (1822-1888).[43] Although Maine was an English legal historian and political theorist, since the patriarchal theory has been associated with him, he is classified among those who have attempted an anthropological interpretation of the family as a social institution. In his *Ancient Law*, published in 1861, he conceives of the primitive family as substantially similar to the Roman family, headed by the patriarch as king and priest of the household. This family was a larger group than the modern institution, containing not only all descendants but all united to it by adoption, including slaves, clients, and other dependents. From it have developed all the higher forms of political organization; the aggregation of homes composed the tribe, that of tribes established the commonwealth. The State, therefore, came from the expanding of its primordial cell. This genealogical organization of society precedes and overlaps the territory grouping. Social union is based upon the bond of kinship. The artificial extension of the family, as a consequence of the worship of ancestors and the desire for male issue to perpetuate family rights, encouraged adoption.

John F. McLennan (1827-1881). Herbert Spencer was the first to attack this hypothesis of Maine's, but opposition was further developed by McLennan. He held that an original promiscuity was replaced by kinship traced through the female line, an establishment of relationship which universally preceded descent through the male line on account of the uncertainty of paternity associated with polyandry. Since female infanticide among primitive peoples brought a scarcity of women, it became necessary to marry outside the tribe, and this led to the practice

[43] *Ancient Law;* also *Early Law and Custom,* chaps. III, IV, and VIII.

of exogamy. Wives were obtained only by capture until civilization had moved beyond early primitive conditions, and then this custom survived in symbol after the original manner of marriage had been superseded. McLennan insisted that the Hebrew scriptures, which according to Maine revealed the chief lineaments of the patriarchal society, do not support the patriarchal theory but rather give evidence of *beena* marriage, and the recognition of kinship through the female line.[44]

Lewis H. Morgan (1818-1881). Morgan, a lawyer by profession, had as a youth become interested in the Seneca-Iroquois Indians who lived near his home; and after serving them professionally before the courts, he was formally adopted into the Seneca tribe. Studying their kinship system and later finding it practiced among the Ojibwa, he was led to the theory that such recognition of relationship was once universal and was the basis of the ethnical unity of the human race. His interest led him to study kinship systems throughout the world and to publish his *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (1870). Later, in *Ancient Society,* he contended that marriage had passed from promiscuity through a series of progressive stages to monogamy; in this evolution five distinct forms of marriage appeared.[45] The family was at first a communal marriage consisting of a group of kinsfolk among whom promiscuity prevailed between all men and women of the same generation. Before this there had existed a widespread promiscuity which he admits can only be deduced since it existed at a time now beyond the reach of positive knowledge.

Johann J. Bachofen (1815-1887). Bachofen, a Swiss anthropologist, was led by his interest in ancient Roman law and Greek antiquity to the belief that mankind had once lived in a state of unlimited promiscuity and that this was common among all primitive people at an early state in their development. His fame came chiefly from *Das Mutterrecht.* Since paternity was uncertain among those living in promiscuity, society was led to the

[44] *The Patriarchal Theory,* pp. 35-50.
[45] *Op. cit.,* pp. 389, 502.

tracing of descent through the mother, and this necessity gave her dominance in the social order. Bachofen held that there were three general periods in the evolution of human sexual relations: the first, when men and women had each other in common; the second, when mother-right, or gynecocracy, prevailed, and kinship and succession followed the maternal line and woman possessed religious and political dominance; and the third, when father-right became supreme.[46] The second stage results from the rebellion of women who find themselves at the mercy of masculine lust. Woman's spiritual superiority permitted her to overcome man's greater strength. "Just as the child receives its first discipline from the mother, so do peoples receive it from woman. Man must serve before he can attain supremacy. To the wife alone it is given to tame the unbridled power of man and to guide him in the path of well-doing." The Amazonism that appeared in the second stage shocked religious feeling, and there resulted a striving for the achievement of a higher type of social relations. This led to the emphasis on the paternal in contrast with the maternal line of descent. "Victorious fatherhood thus becomes as distinctly connected with the heavenly light as prolific motherhood is to the teeming earth." [47]

Edward A. Westermarck (1862-1939).[48] Westermarck, a Finnish anthropologist who after 1890 wrote in England, was generally regarded during his lifetime as the dean of anthropologists in the field of marriage and the family. Marriage is the term generally used for the social institution that regulates sexual relationship. It always implies the right of sexual intercourse. Marriage is also an economic institution. Obligation is placed by society upon the husband to support, if possible, his wife and children. It generally gives him power over them, although in the case of the children this is of limited duration. Marriage originated out of a primeval habit. Even in primitive times the man habitually lived with his wife or wives, and the

[46] *Op. cit.*, p. 19, chaps. VI, XVIII-XIX, and XXI.
[47] Starcke's summary, *Das Mutterrecht*, p. 244; Bachofen, xxvii.
[48] *The History of Human Marriage*, chaps. I, III-IX, XII, XVIII.

children were reared by the co-operation of father and mother, the one being the protector and supporter of the group, the other his helpmate and the nurse of his children. This grouping appears as a habit among many other species of the animal kingdom, but not on the lowest levels of life. He rejects the hypothesis of original promiscuity. Monogamy is the only form of marriage that is permitted among every people. Monogamy is the natural form of marriage, but not on account of the fact that there is usually an almost equal number of men and women, since the proportion frequently varies and sometimes greatly. An excess of marriageable women does become frequently a cause of polygyny, and a comparative scarcity of them a cause of polyandry. A close connection is indicated between sexual modesty rooted in feminine coyness and the aversion to incest.

Robert Briffault (1876-).[49] The title of Robert Briffault's three massive volumes, *The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions*, indicates clearly the point of view of the author. His contribution resulted from his study of the social instincts, which led him to believe that the social characteristics of the human mind came through the operation of instincts that are related to the function of the female rather than the male. Since the animal family out of which the human social group must be assumed to have come is matriarchal and never patriarchal, it is reasonable to suppose that the key to human evolution is to be found in the mothers. He distinguishes between the sexual and the maternal impulses, and insists that the latter were intense among primitive people, while the former were either absent or feebly developed. There was even antagonism between the mating and the sexual impulses. The human social group is a product of the animal family, for it is inconceivable that man's development could take place in isolated groups consisting of only a few individuals. Through the aggregation of family groups, the herd came into being. Briffault believes that the dominance of men and the social inferiority of women are

[49] *Op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 126-129, 141-146, 338, 607; vol. 2, pp. 1, 75; vol. 3, pp. 507, 509-510, 520.

of comparatively late origin, having been preceded by a social state in which women were more influential than men and not dominated by them.

Marriage cannot be thought of as something brought about by the operation of the natural instincts. It is a social institution. Marriage regulations came not from the desire of the man and woman or the social wish to regulate individual relationships, but from the demand for regulation between groups. Briffault interprets individual marriage as an economic relation not originally demanding exclusive sexual possession. Because of the sexual freedom of the primitive peoples, the author challenges Westermarck's definition of marriage as a more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation until after the birth of the offspring. Attacks on the theories of Westermarck appear frequently in Briffault's discussion. Because of the limitations of feminine intelligence, civilization must be credited to patriarchal societies and the resources of the male mind. The social sentiments which alone make possible a society were the immediate derivatives of the feelings which bind the mother and her child, and at first were made up of these and these alone. As an organization dominated by the man, the conventionally assumed patriarchal family was inherently antisocial and was not the unit of society. The family, constituted by ties of sentiment that bound together its members, was the sole living foundation of society. It was at first not a social unit but the whole of society. The indispensable altruistic sentiment which held the group together was the product of the maternal instinct. The primal loyalties are now, and have always been, in the women's keeping and in theirs alone.

Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-). Malinowski, an English ethnologist, has given us a vivid description of social conditions among people living on a simple cultural level, with especial emphasis upon their sexual life, their courtship, marriage, and parenthood relationships. In *The Father in Primitive Psychology*, published in 1927, he describes a group maintaining marriage chiefly for economic reasons. The child has to have a father as

well as a mother because it is unthinkable for the child to be left without the security of support, rather than because of any recognition of the meaning of human reproduction and the fact of paternity. In *The Family among the Australian Aborigines*, published in 1913, and *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, he has given us valuable detailed accounts of the domestic life of culturally simple people.

Margaret Mead (1901-). A similar contribution has been made by Margaret Mead, an American student, especially emphasizing sex attitudes, customs, and practices of the groups investigated as they appear in childhood and adolescence. Among her books are: *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), *Growing Up in New Guinea* (1930), and *Sex and Temperament* (1935). This third volume illustrates the sociological fact that the temperamental differences between the sexes are culturally determined by custom rather than a characteristic trait imposed by Nature upon man and woman.

J. D. Unwin (1895-1936). In *Sex and Culture* (1934)[50] Unwin defines marriage as an economic and sexual relationship between one or more men and one or more women, based upon the customs of any social group and adopted in order to regulate the relation between the sexes. He believes that it is the economic side of married life rather than the sexual which is important to most savages. There were few uncivilized societies which insisted that a girl confine her sexual activities throughout her life to one man, but these few occupied the highest place in the cultural scale. In no instance, he writes, has savage society compelled the man to limit his sexual relationships to one woman. This standard we find only in some civilized societies, but those who have maintained this for the longest period have reached the highest place in the cultural scale thus far attained by the human race. The author severely indicts Briffault for a partisan use of citations, stating that at times the author is even guilty of misstating the meaning of those he quotes.

[50] Pp. 24-25, 474, and elsewhere.

XX. *The Evolution of Social Thought Concerning the Family* (Continued)

The sociologists

Auguste Comte (1798-1857).[1] Comte, who is rightly credited with having given us sociology as an independent science, considered the family as a basic social unit out of which society developed. Instinct and natural affection create the family. It perpetuates and multiplies itself and may be compared to the cell in the biological organism. Marriage, the spontaneous union of the sexes, is a product of instinct and natural affection. It is normally monogamic in form because this is in accord with the natural impulse of human nature. The family as the smallest social unit provides the conditions we need to learn to live together. By giving this tutelage, it makes the most important contribution to the development of humanity. It establishes a bridge between the egoism of the individual and the altruism without which society cannot exist. The family, therefore, must be kept stable that it may not fail to build in human nature the altruism and self-sacrifice indispensable to the security of society. Serious attacks directed against it are symptoms of social disorganization. Marriage, nevertheless, is subject to reconstruction since it must adapt itself to the changes resulting from human development. These modifications require the guidance of scientific knowledge that the institution may not become a prey to arbitrary impulses and sentiments. Society must above all else insure the success of the family as the originating source of altruism and self-sacrifice. Since divorce and

[1] Harriet Martineau, tr., *The Positive Philosophy.*

remarriage encourage selfishness within the family, they should not be permitted. Family life should reflect the differences between the sexes, as should society itself. Women are naturally more sympathetic and affectionate, while men excel in understanding and reasoning.

Lester Ward (1841-1913).[2] Ward's interest in human feeling as a social force led him to give considerable attention to romantic love, which he places in contrast to natural love, nature's provision for the continuation of the human race. Natural love is the original form, and in spite of the derivatives that come from it through development, it remains the main trunk of which the rest are branches. Romantic love results primarily from the great inequality of woman and her dependence. It represents, therefore, woman's first step toward regaining the position she originally held before she yielded to the superior physical force of man. When a man and woman fall in love, each is seeking in the other qualities he or she lacks but wishes. This quest is, however, unconscious to both. Romantic love acts to perfect and balance the human race, and it should have as great a freedom as the safety and stability of society permit. Conjugal love, or the affection existing between a husband and wife, rose out of romantic love, but is different because it frees itself of tumultuous passion and stabilizes vocational and social activity.

A long period of promiscuity preceded the coming of romantic love and left an impression on the race which but for the counter principle of conjugal love would have made monogamy impossible. Monogamy involves an enormous moral strength and requires severe discipline, but the race is developing toward the monogamic ideal. There are great differences between individuals in their distance from it, and this is one of the causes of trouble in marriage. To some, monogamy is still intolerable, to others it is almost unendurable, while to still others it is for the most part satisfactory, and to a con-

[2] *Pure Sociology*, pp. 351-416.

siderable number it is the ideal and no improvement concerning it can be conceived. Maternal love is something entirely different from paternal love. It is primarily a sexual attribute, the result of the sexual pleasure the mother receives from her mammary glands in the suckling of her young. It is therefore an experience of the mammal. Maternal love is essentially a conservative principle which functions biologically in protecting the race. Consanguineal love is a specific expression of consciousness of kind. This love of kindred is exclusively a human experience. Since each love has its negative aspect, *hate*, the meaning of love of kindred appears most clearly in contrast with its opposite, *race hatred.*

Regarding the family, Ward believed that it is most important to gather a just conception of its primitive form. Under gynecocracy there was of course no family in its proper sense, but merely the mother caring for her children in obedience to an instinct. With the coming of androcracy women became the chattels of men. Men fought for women, and not in order to win their favor but to obtain possession of them from some other man. The weaker men were forced to celibacy, and the woman became the monopoly of the strong. This polygamous life established practical certainty as to paternity, and led directly to the patriarchal family. Marriage is from the beginning an association dictated by economic necessity. The original patriarchal family permitted a marriage only of the sort to be found in a harem of seals under the dominance of an old bull. Marriage forms through human evolution have been multitudinous, but they all have had until recently one thing in common, the husband's proprietorship of the wife. When the collision of primitive hordes led to wars resulting in race amalgamation, ceremonial marriages arose recognizing the transference, for a consideration, of woman as property to the man who became her new possessor, and polygyny among the upper classes followed. Throughout all human history the rights of woman have been retarded by custom, law, literature, and public opinion.

William Graham Sumner (1840-1910).[3] None of the early American sociologists dealt so systematically and realistically with the family as did William Graham Sumner. Society is forced to make adjustments through its folkways and mores to the condition of bisexuality. Although human reproduction is basically physical, it ranges beyond its biological sphere so as greatly to affect mental states and social organization. The family, represented by three or more persons related in life and interest, is the unit-cluster of societal organization. This association grows inevitably and originally out of sex functions. The reproductive function so powerfully influences social life that the most primitive of societies have been forced to develop a sex code and a sex policy. The differences between the sexes produce a cleavage which appears throughout the entire societal structure. In spite of the distinction between the sexes, nature has endowed men and women with an attraction that perpetuates the race. Marriage is not, however, the natural sequel of sex passion, nor of anything necessary for reproduction. It is primarily a form of co-operation in self-maintenance, and its bond becomes tighter or looser in response to the advantages of the partnership under the existing circumstances. Maternity puts the female under a handicap which makes needful the assistance of the male. Mother love is shared by the woman with other animals. It is an extension of organic sex life and is as instinctive as the similar care of offspring among the lower animals. Marriage has always meant the union of a man and woman engaged in struggle for livelihood and joined together in the procreation of children within the social framework of the group and the time in which their association was maintained.

Family organization was based on the original blood tie of mother and child. The family was a miniature society, its members joined together by work, dwelling, eating, owning, and subjection. The family is also an organization of authority with inequalities, combinations of powers and discipline, and

[3] W. G. Sumner and A. G. Keller, *The Science of Society*, vol. 3, pp. 1485-2056.

at the time when it first comes within the knowledge of science it reveals the exploiting of some human beings by others. Although marriage and the family have always reacted upon one another, they must be distinguished. One is a sex combination in self-maintenance, while the other is a miniature societal organization. We start the evolution of the domestic institution with the coming of mother-family because at first relationship through the mother is definite and obvious; and so this type of family must have preceded all others. Sumner rejects the idea of a period of woman rule. Economic need, by demanding a better organization than the mother-family could provide, and the demands placed upon the male as a warrior and a hunter encouraged his becoming head of the family and the patriarchal family that came into being was based upon capacity to rule rather than upon blood tie.

Sumner attacks the false education that the people of his time were receiving which ill prepared them for marriage, and also the easy divorce policy which he considers much worse than plain plurality of sex relationship. Pair-marriage requires self-denial if it is to be honorably maintained. The victims of pair-marriage are women who do not marry. Formerly men and women grew into domestic traditions and customs, but now their self-conscious demands make their matrimonial expectations difficult to achieve.

Franklin H. Giddings (1855-1931).[4] The family, which is found in animal as well as in human societies, is the simplest form of genetic aggregation. The human family is a group of kinsmen that have lived together in one locality from their birth. The whole scheme of social organization among primitive peoples is based on kinship. The human family must be classed apart from that of the animal if attention is directed toward phenomena of family relationships that did not appear until there had been reflection and sanction on the part of the social mind. The family is the unitary group of demotic so-

[4] *The Principles of Sociology*, pp. 62-265.

cieties. The domestic group is both a family and a household. As the former, it is a unit in social composition; as the latter, it is an economic, purposive association engaged in the processes of livelihood. It is impossible with any means of certainty to determine the character of the primitive human family, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was an intermediate development between the family of the highest animals and that of the lowest living men. The tendency from the lowest to the highest animals is toward relatively definite family relations. On the lowest social levels of human beings, the commonest marriage is a temporary monogamy. The primitive family may have been founded on masculine power even though descent may have been reckoned through women. The form of marriage is affected by the conditions of life. When circumstances are hard or when for any reason the family holds together until the children are grown, the family is likely to be patronymic, stressing the power of the father.

Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923).[5] The family represents one of the forms of group persistency in which the individuals composing the groups are not considered by themselves, but the group itself comes to have independent individuality. Non-logical feeling tends to make a unit of the family, which continues in logical or pseudo-logical derivation, as appears at present conspicuously in the Chinese society. Among human beings, in contrast with animals, we find that the longer need the young have of their parents or foster parents leads to the development of powerful residues. These residues shape themselves according to the forms of family association prevailing at the time, preserving also the strength required to modify these forms. This is seen in the literature coming from peoples that have had a patriarchal family system. Therefore the only residues which we know are in harmony with the patriarchal type of family relationship. Illustrations are the literature of Graeco-Roman antiquity, the Bible, and the literatures of China,

[5] *The Mind and Society*, vol. 2, pp. 612-615. Tr. by Andrew Bongiorno and Arthur Livingston.

India, and Persia. Familiarity with this type led to the notion that it was the product of a natural law. Later it was discovered that there were other types prevailing among uncivilized and barbarous peoples that contributed to the family organization of our own prehistoric ancestors, as is evidenced by traces that can be found in historic times. The nucleus of the social groups that shaped themselves in the early period of social evolution was the kinship ties that bound individuals together. Although we know that the family was the nucleus of the Roman gens, it is just as certain that other influences led to ties of kinship.

Charles H. Cooley (1864-1929).[6] Cooley tells us that the love of the sexes stresses above all else the need of a new life which only the mate can unlock. The woman usually stands for a richer and franker emotional life, while the man excels in mental grasp. Thus their mutual attraction needs the social sympathy which is an indispensable part of the socializing processes. Love that claims and strives is always in some degree self-love in the sense that it is correlated with individualized, purposeful thought and action. An illustration of this is the love of a mother for her child. Feeling places emphasis upon the relationship; he is *her* child. There is an essential difference between men and women which shows early, the latter being more dependent upon personal support and approval than are men. Men are more aggressive and find it easier to stand alone. Sex passion even in its elemental first appearance reveals the aggressive element, and in its more developed adult expression it is very largely an emotion of power, domination, or appropriation. In no state of feeling is there such stress of personal possession. Cooley's well-known contribution of the idea of the reflected or looking-glass self is especially related to domestic experience since the child, like the adult, is as a rule turned inward emotionally in his attempt to gather up the appraisals that permit him to construct his social self toward the reactions of those bound to him by domestic ties.

[6] *Human Nature and the Social Order,* chap. IV, pp. 184-203.

George H. Mead (1863-1931).[7] The family, according to Mead, is the fundamental unit of reproduction and of the maintenance of the species. All the larger forms of human social organization, such as the clan or the State, are developments or extensions of the family group. Thus in a sense everything that characterizes human society is a product of the relation between the sexes and between parents and children. The family includes experiences of parent-child relationship due to the necessities of infancy, and also the relationship between the sexes, which, unlike the helplessness of the child, may be relatively permanent. In the human group, as contrasted with the animal family, there are group attitudes of mutual defense and attack, and these co-operative expressions, combined with the attitudes of the family, provide the situations from which selves arrive. Once we have the advent of the self, the further development of the society on the self-conscious basis becomes possible. The parent's care of the child, which continues and expands with the growth of the latter, reveals a progress of relatively simple reactions toward an order of behavior which is highly complex.

The economists

Frédéric Le Play (1806-1882).[8] Le Play is usually given credit for the social survey method of investigation. He was by profession an engineer, and his specialty was metallurgy. This he gave up in 1848 because of his interest in social reform. Believing, as did Comte, that the family was the elementary and basic unit of society, he attempted to develop a methodology for its study. To him the fundamental element of the family was its economic aspect. He sought, therefore, to discover in great detail the income and expenditures of the families of working people. Although the economic life was the central point of his investigations, he took into account other influences

[7] *Mind, Self, and Society*, pp. 229-241.
[8] *Les Ouvriers Européens.*

that in his mind operated upon family experience, including location—that is, the geographic environment, and the religious, moral, and social characteristics of the individual family. He believed the patriarchal family favored morality and social organization, and he desired, therefore, to re-establish it. In order to carry on his investigations he developed the idea of the family budget. He opposed birth control. His formula for social investigation was Place, Work, Family. Le Play's methodology was taken over by Patrick Geddes, a Scottish sociologist, and developed into what we now call "regional surveys."

Christian Lorenz Ernst Engel (1821-1896). Engel,[9] a German statistician, drew his interest in social economics from Le Play and in statistics from Quételet. He demonstrated the usefulness of statistics in the study of social experience, and his chief contribution to the thought of the family was through his application of the statistical method to the expenditures of working men's families. He demonstrated that the smaller the family income, the greater the proportion of the income spent on food.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) and *Frederic Engels (1820-1895).* The work of these two social theorists and political revolutionists was bound so closely together that their significant contribution to thought about the family[10] may be dealt with as a joint production. The interest of neither was in the family, but in economic, political organization. This was looked upon as a struggle of classes, an example of the Darwinian hypothesis. Social history is the record of struggle between the classes. This warfare will continue until the proletariat, now exploited, gains supremacy and builds a classless society. This can only come about by social revolutions, which in Great Britain and America may happen without bloodshed, but not elsewhere. The significance of this theory of economic determinism, in so far as it is related to the

[9] For bibliography of his works, see *Handworterbuch des Staatswissenschaften,* vol. 3 (4th ed.), p. 726; W. A. Berridge, E. A. Winslow and R. A. Flinn, *Purchasing Power of the Consumer,* pp. 168-172, 203-204.

[10] E. Unterman, tr., Engels' *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.*

family, must be found in the influence it has had upon the development of socialism and communism, thereby indirectly affecting the family theory, and when carried into practice, as in Russia, also affecting family functioning.

The feminists

The casual reader of early feministic literature may gather the impression that the leaders of the movement toward greater political and social equality of women were practical, aggressive reformers, little interested in domestic theory. The fact is that, however much they were concerned with increasing the social and legal opportunities of women through education and legislation, they were fundamentally contending against an ideal of women which they not only found personally unacceptable but which, they were convinced, represented a social retardation, antagonistic to the interests of both men and women. They were therefore struggling against a socially accepted definition of women which was a culmination of biological and social evolution cemented in custom, dogma claiming to interpret Christianity, and ecclesiastical, statutory, and common law. From the first, their opponents saw the radical meaning of the new crusade and chiefly based their counterattack upon the menace they prophesied it would bring to marriage and the family. These critics recognized that the position of women could not be changed without a reconstruction of domestic relationships. This attitude was often well expressed by the orthodox clergy, as appears in the following extract:

> If the vine, whose strength and beauty is to lean upon the trellis work, and half conceal its clusters, thinks to assume the independence and overshadowing nature of the elm, it will not only cease to bear fruit, but fall in shame and dishonor into the dust. We cannot, therefore, but regret the mistaken conduct of those who encourage females to bear an obtrusive and ostentatious part in measures of reform, and countenance any of that sex who so far forget themselves as to itinerate in the character of public lecturers

and teachers. We especially deplore the intimate acquaintance and conversation of females with regard to things which ought not to be named; by which that modesty and delicacy which is the charm of domestic life, and which constitutes the true influence of woman in society, is consumed, and the way opened, as we apprehend, for degeneracy and ruin.[11]

Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797). Because of her *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792), Mary Wollstonecraft rightly deserves credit for the starting of the modern feministic movement. Influenced by childhood experience, her struggle to earn a living, and her firsthand knowledge of the consequences of an unhappy marriage through her sister's experience, she struck at the inferiority of women due to lack of education and economic dependency. She writes:

I cannot help lamenting that women of a superior cast have not a road open by which they can pursue more extensive plans of usefulness and independence. I may excite laughter by dropping a hint, which I mean to pursue at some future time, for I really think that women ought to have representatives, instead of being arbitrarily governed without having any direct share allowed them in the deliberations of government.

.

Business of various kinds they might likewise pursue, if they were educated in a more orderly manner, which might save many from common and legal prostitution. Women would not then marry for a support, as men accept of places under government, and neglect the implied duties; nor would an attempt to earn their own subsistence, a most laudable one! sink them almost to the level of those poor abandoned creatures who live by prostitution.

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). Later John Stuart Mill, who gave English utilitarianism its chief literary expression, insisted

[11] Extract from a Pastoral Letter of the General Association of Massachusetts to the churches under their care, 1837. From *The History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. 1, pp. 81-82.

that already there had been sufficient social change to make the conventional status of women an anachronism.

. . . We think and talk about the political revolutions of the world, but we do not pay sufficient attention to the fact that there has taken place among us a silent domestic revolution: women and men are, for the first time in history, really companions. Our traditions about the proper relations between them have descended to us from a time when their lives were apart—when they were separate in their thoughts because they were separate both in their amusements and in their serious occupations. The man spent his hours of leisure among men: all his friendships, all his real intimacies were with men: with men alone did he converse on any serious subject: the wife was either a plaything or an upper servant. All this among the educated classes is changed: men no longer give up their spare time to violent outdoor exercise and boisterous conviviality with male associates: the home has acquired the ascendancy: the two sexes now really pass their lives together: the women of the family are the man's habitual society: the wife is his chief associate, his most confidential friend, and often his most trusted counselor.

.

The time has come when, if women are not raised to the level of men, men will be pulled down to theirs. The women of a man's family are either a stimulus and a support to his higher aspirations, or a drag upon them.[12]

Seneca Falls Convention. In the United States the increasing place that woman's self-expression had found through the temperance and antislavery agitations gave the Woman's Rights movement a more aggressive and practical turn which was first expressed at the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848. Among the statements of grievances formulated in imitation of the Declaration of Independence appear the following:

. . . In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes,

[12] Speech by John Stuart Mill, in the British Parliament, May 20, 1867. Reprinted by the College Equal Suffrage League.

her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon a false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.[13]

It is evident that the feministic leadership and the leaders of the opposition had one basic agreement—that the granting of political suffrage to women meant fundamentally changing their social, political, and economic status, a radical departure that was bound to be reflected in marriage and the family. This to the first meant an elevating and maturing of domestic relationships, while to the other group it seemed a menace to the home. The opposition, which was based upon the theory that the relationship of the sexes had been fixed permanently by nature, was never more forcefully stated than by Francis Parkman, the historian.

. . . Women have great special tasks assigned them in the work of life, and men have not. To these tasks their whole nature, moral and physical, is adjusted. There is scarcely a distinctive quality of women that has not a direct or indirect bearing upon them. Everything else in their existence is subordinated to the indispensable functions of continuing and rearing the human race; and, during the best years of life, this work, fully discharged, leaves little room for any other. Rightly considered, it is a work no less dignified than essential. It is the root and stem of national existence, while the occupations of men are but the leaves and branches. On women of the intelligent and instructed classes depends the future of the nation. If they are sound in body and mind, impart this soundness to a numerous offspring, and rear them to a sense of responsibility and duty, there are no national evils that we cannot overcome. If

[13] By Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Matilda Joslyn Gage. Adapted from the *History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. 1, pp. 63-73. New York, 1881.

they fail to do this their part, then the masses of the coarse and unintelligent, always of rapid increase, will overwhelm us and our institutions.[14]

Margaret Fuller (1810-1850). Firmly placed among the intellectual leaders of New England, Margaret Fuller was in a strategic position to lead an assault upon the inferiority of woman as detrimental to marital fellowship. The following gives the spirit of her teaching and her personal attitude:

> I would have her (woman) free from compromise, from complaisance, from helplessness, because I would have her good enough and strong enough to love one and all beings, from the fullness, not the poverty, of being. . . . A profound thinker has said, "No married woman can represent the female world, for she belongs to her husband." . . . That is the very fault of marriage and the relation between the sexes, that the woman does belong to the man, instead of forming a whole with him . . . woman, self-centered, would never be absorbed by any relation; it would be only an experience to her as to a man. It is a vulgar error that love, *a* love to woman is her whole existence She, also, is born for Truth and Love in their universal energy.[15]

Results of the Civil War. The Civil War decidedly stimulated the various influences that were lessening the disabilities of women and increasing their opportunities. One consequence was the aggressive campaign for suffrage in which Susan B. Anthony (1820-1906) and Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902) were foremost. Some states were already permitting women to vote in school elections, and soon the movement was given new impetus by the decision of Wyoming and Utah territories that women should enjoy with men complete political equality. The trend toward a new domestic philosophy had clearly started,[16] reinforced by fundamental advances of women

[14] By Francis Parkman. Pamphlet issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. This polemic was first published sometime between 1876 and 1880.

[15] *Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli*, vols. 1, 2.

[16] E. R. Groves, *The American Woman*, p. 307.

in economic, vocational, and social opportunity. The great majority of the American people, however, were in greater or less degree committed to a domestic system based upon the doctrine of woman's inferiority. Wyoming, once it became a state, was the first in the Union, indeed the first political organization in the world, to give women the suffrage on the same basis as men. As state after state followed, it was apparent that the woman's movement was broader than any suffrage achievement could satisfy. Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1860-1935) with rare talent pushed forward the thesis that only by becoming economically independent could woman maintain her individuality and prove herself a proper mate for modern man. She must emerge from being a house servant to equal partnership with man, the only basis for successful modern marriage.[17]

Ellen Key (1849-1926).[18] A systematic statement of the theory of domestic relationships underlying the Woman's Rights movement is yet to be written. The commanding figure, through her definition of the proper goals of this advance of women, was Ellen Key. In her *Love and Marriage* she advocated radical departures, of which the following assertions are representative:

1. That there is the need of freedom for love selection under conditions favorable to the progress of the race, with limitation not of the right of love but of procreation when conditions are racially unfavorable.
2. That love should be the moral ground of marriage, with the consequence that he who ceases to love should have the moral as well as the legal right to withdraw from the marriage if he chooses to exercise this privilege.
3. That the ideal of marriage should be the perfectly free union of a man and woman who because of mutual love wish to promote the happiness of each other and the welfare of the race.

[17] Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *Women and Economics.*

[18] *Love and Marriage,* pp. 45-46, 150, 290, 350.

Miss Key interprets the domestic development that required man consciously to cultivate nature as a progress rooted in some mysterious longing for perfection, which in the course of evolution has raised instinct to passion, passion to love, and which is now striving to raise love itself to an even greater love.

Lucy Stone (1818-1893). Lucy Stone was one of the most militant of the early leaders of the feminist movement in the United States. She was among the first of the American women who from the beginning of their public careers concentrated upon the advancement of women's rights. At Oberlin, the first co-educational institution, she closed her college career by refusing to write an honorary essay because, according to the academic tradition, its delivery had to be turned over to a man. This and an earlier experience of discrimination on the basis of sex taught her the significance of the conventions as a means of limiting the life of women, and she struck boldly at the most entrenched of these—the surrender by the married woman of her former name. In her own marriage, she determined to keep her name as a symbol of personal freedom, a position in which she was supported by her husband. By refusing to register for a Massachusetts election as other than Lucy Stone, she became the center of a violent controversy. More clearly than any other of her co-leaders, she saw that woman must be given an equality with man in the conventions that regulate marriage and courtship, customs that at present support masculine dominance, or, whatever gains she might make through legislation, woman would still remain socially and domestically handicapped as compared with man. The National Woman's Party brought the feminist movement in the United States to its logical climax. Believing that even protective legislation, however desirable in an earlier period of woman's economic career in the United States, fundamentally encouraged discrimination and rested upon the acceptance of the idea of inherent economic and social limitations of the female as compared with the male, they committed themselves to conserving women's rights by the more mature program of absolute political equality, advocating an

amendment to the Constitution to read as follows: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

The radicals

James Hinton (1822-1875).[19] Hinton felt that sexual energy on the human level was both starved by puritanism and wasted by licentiousness. He believed that, much as prostitution needed to be abolished, this could not be done unless other social changes accompanied efforts at reform. He insisted that it was not the virtue but the prudery of women that prostitution protected. Prostitution could be eliminated only by enlarging the human love-life. He said the puritan enters "bondage good," just as the prodigal enters "bondage bad," and he wished to free human nature from both coercions. It should be the woman's business in the future to keep the sexual from being sensual by the preventive methods of a true healer rather than by spending such great energy in attempting to cure the evils of sensuality. Holding strongly to the conviction that monogamy was good in its ideal form, he insists that we have arrived at it as a legal or universal form too soon to maintain it in its integrity, and therefore have called into being more licentiousness than would be possible under open polyandry or polygyny. Rigid monogamy confronts women with the impossible task of being a wife, a mistress, a mother, and a housekeeper all in one. Most men and a few women are born polygamists, and most women and some men are born monogamists. If we gave up monogamy, prostitution would disappear because more women would be married, mistresses would not need to become prostitutes, and a career would be open to women which would give permanence without their surrendering marriage. Jealousy is love's shadow and never part of its real substance. Hinton looked toward a time when women would accept a shared

[19] Mrs. Havelock Ellis, *James Hinton*, pp. 98-168.

marital life, the men reverencing and sustaining the women they now destroy. Apparently this sharing was to be one-sided since the true bodily relation of man and woman was based upon the fact that man's body is as much constructed for more sexual activity than the woman's as it is for demanding more food. He used Utah as an example of the way in which polygamy casts out prostitution. Mrs. Ellis perhaps best states Hinton's thesis, for, although he writes with strong emotion, precision and clarity seem to escape him, in his plea to women to enlarge their life, pull down their narrow wall, and accept what he calls a "refined polygamy."

Edward Carpenter (1844-1929).[20] *Love's Coming of Age* was written in 1896 by Carpenter, a former clergyman, who, changing his religious views, became a lecturer on science and music. On a tour in the United States, Carpenter met Walt Whitman, by whom he was greatly influenced. Carpenter contended that the natural differences between man and woman that have made the former the more active and the latter the more passive have been greatly accentuated and exaggerated during the historic period until maximum divergence and absolute misunderstanding between the sexes have been reached. Since a half-grown man is a tyrant, masculine maturity has meant for many ages the serfdom of woman. The nobler womanhood of the future must proceed from a recognition that women must have complete freedom as to the disposal of their sex life and from the conviction that whatever mistakes individuals may make, women as a rule will use such freedom rationally and well. As long as man is only half-grown and woman is a serf or a parasite it cannot be expected that marriage will be particularly successful. The marriage progress is an orgy of first satisfactions followed by satiety on the physical plane, then vacuity of affection and boredom, even nausea. The marriage continues because of the monetary dependence of the woman, the sex needs of the man, and the fear of public opinion, with

[20] *Love's Coming of Age*, pp. 38-143. Excerpts reprinted by permission of The Vanguard Press, publishers.

the result that both husband and wife are narrowed and blunted. However:

> In all men who have reached a certain grade of evolution, and certainly in almost all women, the deep rousing of the sexual nature carries with it a romance and tender emotional yearning towards the object of affection, which lasts on and is not forgotten, even when the sexual attraction has ceased to be strongly felt.

Marriage should be a private relationship not interfered with by the State unless children result from the alliance.

> . . . Real love is only possible in the freedom of society; and freedom is only possible when love is a reality. The subjection of sex-relations to legal conventions is an intolerable bondage, but of course it is a bondage inescapable as long as people are slaves to a merely physical desire. The two slaveries in fact form a sort of natural counterpoise, the one to the other.

Bertrand Russell (1872-). Bertrand Russell is the best known of those at present advocating a new and freer sex code. He thinks the increasing sex experience of young people before marriage is a healthy sign. He also advocates a temporary marriage which should be a prelude to a more serious marriage in which children would be expected. Greater freedom would prove an advantage to women, for, Russell is inclined to think, the intellectual inferiority of women, in so far as it exists, is mainly due to the restraint upon curiosity which the fear of sex leads them to impose. Russell also advocates much sex freedom after marriage and insists that adultery in itself is no ground for divorce. Such infidelity should not become domestically disturbing if there be no "melodramatic orgies of jealousy."

Judge Ben B. Lindsey (1869-).[21] Judge Ben B. Lindsey widely advocated in public lectures and debates, in 1927, the

[21] B. B. Lindsey and Wayne Y. Evans, *The Companionate Marriage*.

legal establishment of a provision for a temporary marital relationship between young men and women, for which he chose the designation "companionate marriage," thus misusing the term which M. M. Knight had put forth to describe a marriage in which a husband and wife intended not to become parents.[22] Although maintaining that this relationship was not the same as a trial marriage, there being some distinction difficult to put into words, his definition of the suggested change as "a legal marriage with legalized birth control and with the right of divorce by mutual consent to childless couples usually without payment of alimony" makes his proposal something quite different from the childless union which Knight was striving to have society, in taxation and other practical matters, recognize. As a consequence, Dr. Knight was led later, writing in the *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, to advise the dropping of the term "companionate," since its meaning had become ambiguous and emotionally controversial. In spite of the wide attention given the companionate marriage scheme of Lindsey, American youth never regarded it seriously for, however much in sympathy they were with a freer code of sex relations, they had no disposition to enter upon an experimental matrimonial arrangement even though it had an open door for retreat in divorce by mutual consent. Those who were most given to sexual freedom before marriage did not respond to the idea of a temporary or preliminary legal status as a substitute for the commitments of orthodox marriage. Folsom has judiciously summarized the issue as to whether or not an ideology of trial marriage is to be built up as the normal procedure.[23]

Robert Owen,[24] *August Bebel*,[25] and *Robert Dale Owen*[26] are three critics of marriage who are best catalogued among the radicals.

[22] M. M. Knight, "The Companionate and the Family," *Journal of Social Hygiene*, 10:257-267.

[23] J. K. Folsom, *The Family*, p. 411.

[24] *Marriages of the Priesthood of the Old Immoral World.*

[25] *Woman and Socialism.*

[26] *Marriage and Placement.*

The birth control movement

The birth control movement, like the feminist movement, although of the greatest significance to marriage and the family, has not as yet achieved an adequate expression in either social or philosophic systems of thought. This does not mean that it is devoid of a basic theory, but that, as in the case of many other practices and agitations that profoundly affect the family, its energy has been expended chiefly in practical efforts to change thought rather than in an endeavor to establish its logical premises. The fact that there are so many programs destined to change fundamentally domestic experience, that have not as yet been given an adequate interpretation as social philosophies, reveals how much the family has been taken for granted and how necessary it is for the student to seek the ideas that are implicit in some of the most consequential social changes that are affecting marriage and the family.

Malthus (1766-1834). Although, as is the case with social innovations, the beginning of the modern birth control movement must be arbitrarily placed, Malthus, because of his essay on the principles of population, 1798, may be said to have sired the line of thinking that issued in what we now know as the birth control movement. This does not mean that previously there was lack of interest in the control of conception or even that such methods of birth control as were practiced were in no measure successful. It is not too much to say that "some forms of limitations on the rate of increase are undoubtedly as old as the life history of man." [27] The ethnologists have gathered a great quantity of material that reveals the effort put forth even in preliterate societies to limit population increase. These schemes, to be sure, did not so much consist of the use of contraceptives, as they did of the practice of abortion, infanticide, and the like. These attempts to control the population increase, whatever their measure of effectiveness, demonstrate how early human nature sought what is now provided with a great degree

[27] Norman E. Himes, *Medical History of Contraception*, p. 3.

of reliability by various contraceptive methods. Malthus by his writing succeeded in focusing much of the serious thought of his time upon the problem of population as a basic human interest.

Francis Place (1771-1854). Francis Place, the English labor reformer, is credited with having given us the first work on population in the English language recommending birth control. In his *Principle of Population*, which was a reply to the objections of William Godwin to the Malthus thesis and an examination of the remedies proposed by Malthus for the overgrowth of population, Place frankly committed himself to the need of regulating births. He says that if measures were adopted that would prevent the breeding of a greater number of children than a couple might wish or could afford to maintain without lowering their standard of living, there would be a demand for labor, and wages would rise so as to provide a comfortable subsistence for all. No one would be denied marriage on account of the economic pressure of a large family.[28] Although James Mill somewhat earlier had been of the opinion that limitation was desirable, the definite stand that Place took in his effort to bring birth control into practice justly entitles him to be considered the founder of the modern birth control movement.[29] The liability this brought him in his public career is best illustrated by the fact that even so late a biography of Place as Graham Wallas's (1898) gives slight attention to the interest of Place in population and his advocacy of the limitation of human increase. Place's attempt to disseminate interest in and knowledge of contraception among the English working classes by means of handbills which he circulated [30] shows how strong were his practical motives. Richard Carlisle was his most aggressive disciple. His pamphlet, *What is Love?*, first published in 1825 and the next year reprinted as *Every Woman's Book or What is Love*, had a large circulation.

[28] Norman E. Himes, ed., pp. 176-177.
[29] *Ibid.*, Editor's Introduction, p 44.
[30] Himes, *Medical History of Contraception*, p. 213.

Robert Dale Owen (1801-1877). In the United States, the birth control movement had its beginning in *Moral Physiology*, written by Robert Dale Owen, the eldest son of Robert Owen. This book, first published in 1830, was widely read. It attempted frankly to appraise the various techniques of birth control then known. A glimpse of the thinking behind this program appears in Owen's remark in answer to the criticism that his method *(baudruche or condom)* placed control in the hands of the man, that the only effectual protection the woman had was to refuse relations with any man lacking honor and that if this were done, public opinion respecting the rights of women during sexual intimacies would gradually be developed.

Dr. Charles Knowlton (1800-1850). Knowlton had been influenced, as was Owen, by the agitation in England inaugurated by Place. His *Fruits of Philosophy* appeared in 1833. This book also obtained a large circulation, eventually bringing the author into trouble with the courts. Knowlton chiefly recommended douching as a contraceptive technique.

Bradlaugh, Drysdale, Noyes. The trial in England of Charles Bradlaugh and Dr. George Drysdale for their attempt to spread contraceptive knowledge widely circulated the idea that birth control was possible.[31] An original contribution to the idea of a control of sexual relationships so as not to lead to pregnancy resulted from John Humphrey Noyes's idea of male continence which appears to have had unquestioned success as a method of birth limitation in the Oneida Community.

Margaret Sanger; Marie Stopes. It was through the effort and leadership of Margaret Sanger (1883-) that the birth control movement emerged as an international agitation and gained an organization and legal status that have made it one of the most significant influences affecting marriage and the family throughout the world. Contributions have come from a great number of writers, physicians, scientific specialists, and agitators, but the momentum has largely gathered about Mrs. Sanger, in part because of her leadership in the agitation for

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

birth control and in part because the opposition has so largely been directed against her as a personification of the agitation. The term "birth control," although misleading in its connotation, has become thoroughly established. This also has tended to emphasize her leadership. Her motive, like that of Place, has been to lessen poverty and in addition, in a greater degree than his, to decrease the burden of too frequent or ill-advised pregnancies. Marie Stopes (1880-) has had great influence, especially in England, in spreading the idea of birth control. In the United States, in contrast with the relative lack of interest on the part of medical men in birth control until very recently, the studies and writings of Robert L. Dickinson have greatly contributed to the advance of contraceptive knowledge.

Modern birth control movement. The modern birth control movement had its origin in benevolent purposes, in the belief that control of conception will lessen poverty, promote eugenics, decrease the suffering and diseases associated with too frequent and too many pregnancies, but its theoretical meaning must be found in its domestic implications. These are that marital compatibility will be fostered by releasing intercourse in marriage from the uncontrolled liability of pregnancy, and that intercourse, although in the scheme of nature designed to further reproduction, has a physiological, psychic, and social value that justifies it as a husband-wife relation even though this means the artificial regulation of nature's purpose; that this power of control, like other innovations and discoveries of human culture giving man command over natural processes, may be an advantage to domestic security and a means of strengthening marriage as a fellowship of affection; and that, rightly used, it may act as a eugenic resource, even though at present, because of uneven distribution of information, birth control is in many countries a dysgenic influence on population growth.

Opposition to birth control. The opposition to birth control not only attacks it as an unsocial, morally disrupting, and therefore unbenevolent crusade but also strikes at the underlying assumptions implicit in the doctrine of contraceptive control.

Each of the major implications is challenged and the issues emerge, whether it is humanly advantageous or detrimental, morally right or wrong, to interfere with the natural processes of husband-wife sexual relations. This has been clearly and forcefully stated by a chief opponent of birth control, Pope Pius XI (1857-1939), in his encyclical, "On Christian Marriage in Relation to Present Conditions, Needs, and Disorders of Society," in the following words:

As regards the evil use of matrimony—to pass over the arguments which are shameful ones—not infrequently others that are false and exaggerated are put forward. Holy Mother Church very well understands and clearly appreciates all that is said regarding the health of the mother and the danger to her life. And who would not grieve to think of these things? Who is not filled with the greatest admiration when he sees a mother risking her life with heroic fortitude, that she may preserve the life of the offspring which she has conceived? God alone, all bountiful and all merciful as He is, can reward her for the fulfilment of the office allotted to her by nature, and will assuredly repay her in a measure full to overflowing.

Holy Church knows well that not infrequently one of the parties is sinned against rather than sinning when for a grave cause he or she reluctantly allows the perversion of the right order. In such a case, there is no sin, provided that, mindful of the law of charity, he or she does not neglect to seek to dissuade and deter the partner from sin. Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the marriage state use their right in the proper manner although on account of natural reasons, either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth.

For in matrimony as well as in the use of the matrimonal rights there are also secondary ends, such as mutual aid, the cultivating of mutual love, and the quieting of concupiscence which husband and wife are not forbidden to consider so long as they are subordinated to the primary end and so long as the intrinsic nature of the act is preserved.

Another very grave crime is to be noted, venerable brethren, which regards the taking of the life of the offspring hidden in the mother's womb.

However much we may pity the mother whose health and even life is gravely imperiled in the performance of the duty allotted to her by nature, nevertheless what could ever be a sufficient reason for excusing in any way the direct murder of the innocent? This is precisely what we are dealing with here. Whether inflicted upon the mother or upon the child, murder of the innocent is against the precept of God and the law of nature; "thou shalt not kill": the life of each is equally sacred and no one has the power, not even the public authority, to destroy it.[32]

One thing appears certain: the popularizing of birth control will prove as consequential a social innovation in its effects on marriage and the family as anything that thus far has happened in the history of the human race.

Freud and psychoanalysis

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939).[33] To Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, we owe a most searching interest in the meaning of sex in the human career. His theories force the recognition of the complexities of the psychic content of sex from the earliest days of childhood, both as a causal influence and as a deposit of eventful happenings and suggestion. His writings, attracting great attention by their originality and unorthodoxy, did much to wipe away the barriers that were hampering the investigation of what we now know to be, apart from its physical significance in relation to reproduction, an important contribution to the making of personality.

The most direct discussion of Freud concerning marriage and the family appears in his *Civilization and Its Discontents.* Man's

[32] *Op. cit.*, an encyclical published on January 9, 1931. The document is in three parts, the first dealing with the Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Marriage, the second opposing such modern tendencies as birth control and companionate marriage, and the third stating the remedies which the Pope feels will restore matrimony to its proper place in modern society. The Vatican's message is particularly interesting in the light of the opinions expressed at the Lambeth Conference (a gathering of all the bishops of the Anglican communion) in England in the summer of 1930.

[33] *Civilization and Its Discontents*, pp. 71-73, 103, 121.

sense of guilt goes back to the very earliest primal ambivalency of feelings toward the father. It represents "an eternal struggle between Eros and the destructive or death instinct." As soon as one goes beyond the family, conflict arises; so long as one remains within the family, this guilt expresses itself in the Oedipus complex. Whenever a man tries to institute wider forms of communal life, the same conflict is repeated but in more intense form. If civilization is an inevitable course of development from family life on to the social group, it brings an intensification of the sense of guilt. The family has its conflict also with the group because of its emphasis upon the individual. The closer the ties of the family, the more its members cling together and the harder it is for them to enter into the larger out-of-the-family life. Getting detached from the family is, then, a problem of every adolescent. This ordeal has become an integral part of every process of mental evolution. There is also conflict of interests between man and woman. The former becomes identified with the work of civilization which it is his business chiefly to serve, while all the interests of the other sex are turned toward the family and sex. The meaning of the evolution of culture is a struggle between Eros and Death. The life of the individual human being has two great powers—the compulsion to work and the power to love. This second, unless it is lifted out of its erotic atmosphere, makes one dependent on something external, his chosen love-object, and therefore open to painful suffering. In its highest development, love is carried to a social expression. In the family we find the original form plus a refinement that influences civilization.

Granville Stanley Hall (1846-1924). Psychology as it has developed into a modern science has profoundly influenced social thinking regarding marriage and the family. For the most part, however, this has been a by-product of investigations and discussions specifically directed toward other than family and marriage interests. G. Stanley Hall because of his pioneering deserves a place in any survey of social thinking regarding the family. Founding the first experimental laboratory in psychology in this

country at Johns Hopkins University, Hall later as president of Clark University greatly stimulated the study of childhood, adolescence, senescence, and sex. Influential as were his books and writings, of which his *Adolescence* (1904) has most lasting importance, his greatest service was the effect he had upon others who gave themselves to the investigation of some phase of child life.

The sexologists

Hindu erotic literature. It is in the literature of ancient India [34] that we find an erotic interest that has never been excelled, but which because it was directed toward making the most of the art of love deserves recognition in the evolution of sexology. These writers emphasized the fact that sexual adjustment was primarily a responsibility of the male. They insisted, however, that woman had the great erotic need. Vatsya Yana is a representative author. Concerning him, we know nothing except that for sixteen centuries or more his guidebook to love has been an erotic influence in India. He expounded in great detail the principles that needed to be observed in awakening and satisfying passion. He went so far in his analysis as even to discuss how to steal another's wife while keeping one's own. In spite of his erotic exaggeration he annunciated principles of marital conduct that have been repeated if not copied by recent writers dealing with problems of sexual adjustment.[35] Vatsya Yana is only one of many Indian writers who have made much of the technique of physical love, and who therefore are the antitheses of the teachers of occidental puritanism.

Havelock Ellis (1859-1939). Although in the Orient, especially in India, attention to sex and its practices has been carried farthest, Havelock Ellis won a commanding position in occidental thinking of sex because of his seven volumes on the *Psychology of Sex.* In late adolescence, struggling with the

[34] Johann J. Meyer, *Sexual Life in Ancient India,* vols. 1 and 2.
[35] Edward Windsor, *The Hindu Art of Love,* pp. 6-13.

perplexities of sex, he determined to give his life to the attempt to eliminate its mysteries and give it a scientific interpretation. Later he gained the necessary medical background for such an undertaking. He was also greatly influenced by the writings of James Hinton. In 1897 he published his first volume in *Studies in the Psychology of Sex.* Although this remained his chief contribution, he wrote considerably discussing various phases of marriage. The task to which Ellis set himself in these studies was to draw together information regarding human sex life in all its aspects from case material and from history and to present it objectively within a scientific background.

Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935). Hirschfeld, a German sexologist, one of the founders of the Medical Society for Sexual Science, became the first specialist in psychosexual diseases. In addition to various practical efforts to advance social hygiene, Hirschfeld was a prolific writer, and his publications had a great part in establishing the science of sexology. In 1918 he established the Institute of Sexual Science, later taken over by the Prussian government as the Magnus Hirschfeld Foundation. In connection with this, he started the first marriage consultation department and carried on weekly questionnaire evenings during which questions handed in anonymously were answered by physicians connected with the Institute, a service to which large audiences responded. His most important contributions in English translation are: *Homosexuality in Man and Woman; Sexual Knowledge* (in five volumes); and *Men and Women: The World Journey of a Sexologist.*

W. F. Robie (1866-1928). Dr. Robie, a physician at Baldwinville, Massachusetts, by recognizing the significance of sex in his general practice, developed a considerable reputation as a marital counselor. His interest in rational sex hygiene led him to write several books in the attempt to put in popular form information that he had learned from experience that married men and women frequently needed. Among these, *Rational Sex Ethics* (1916) is, for the student of social thought concerning marriage and the family, most important.

The following brief summary of a statement of Robie's shows not only the practicality of the author but his more modern insight as compared with the physicians of his time.[36] Conscious or semiconscious autoeroticism is practiced in some form for at least a period by nearly every male and by a majority of females. This in itself rarely harms a normal individual and is not a cause of abnormality or neuroticism but a symptom. The harmful results reported by physicians or imagined by the individual who believes that he has injured himself are in most cases the products of psychic shock, worry, anxiety, and fear resulting from the difficulty of the individual in quickly breaking the practice or removing the former habit from the memory. Frequently this reaction is the result of suggestion coming from quacks who for purposes of exploitation have taught that the habit is certain to destroy the body and the soul. As a result those who have been overwhelmed with the idea of the evil consequences of autoeroticism and have found themselves unable to control their sexual desire have had recourse to prostitution, which has given them feelings of guilt, lowered their standards, and, most serious of all, has in many cases left them with venereal diseases with which they have infected their wives. Whatever the advantages of continence, it has to be recognized that those who have developed strong sex desire by their practice of masturbation cannot immediately rid themselves of the habit, except in exceptional cases when they are extremely strong in will power. Although Robie took the attitude toward masturbation which is now generally assumed by the scientist, he did believe that the habit should be discouraged and in his practice was unusually successful in helping young men regain the ability to maintain continence.

His books were assailed by Societies for the Prevention of Vice, leading to prosecution by the government, the withdrawal of his books from publication, and the breaking up of their plates. An indication of the limitations under which he tried to

[36] W. F. Robie, *Rational Sex Ethics*, pp. 100-101.

further an intelligent attitude toward sex appears in the confession of a foremost American sociologist to the author that he was threatened with indictment by the Federal Government because he had contributed to a fund that made possible the publication of one of Robie's books.

Dr. Robert L. Dickinson (1861-). Dr. Dickinson by his writings, by his patient and persistent effort to enlist the interest of medical science in the problems of sex, and especially by his development of a technique for premarriage examination designed to eliminate physiological complications in sexual adjustment, has made the most important contribution of American medical science in the field of marriage. Unlike the material gathered by Havelock Ellis, his case records come from his active practice and are both more normal and more representative. The information he has gathered and analyzed is basic to any adequate understanding of American matrimonial experiences. His writings of greatest value to the student of marriage are: *A Thousand Marriages: A Medical Study of Sex Adjustment*, with Lura Beam as co-author; *Control of Conception*, an illustrated medical manual with Louise Stevens Bryant as co-author; *The Single Woman*, 650 case records studied for sex education, with Lura Beam as co-author; and *Topographical Atlas of Human Sex Anatomy*. Fortunately for the advancement of the science of marriage, Dr. Dickinson has other contributions in process of preparation for publication.

Education for marriage and the family

There has been a distinctive development in the United States leading to instruction in preparation for marriage and family life which has had great meaning as it has led to wide and serious interest in matters that concern marriage and the family. The following briefly traces its early development:[37]

[37] Lemo Dennis Rockwood, "History and Status of the Movement for Education in Family Life at the High School and College Levels," *Parent Education*, 7.10-16, 47. Reprinted by permission.

Earlier development. Education for family life, marriage, and parenthood at the secondary and college levels is less than twenty years old. Its history coincides roughly with three developments: the psychological study of children; the study of problems of present day family life by sociologists, home economists, and others; and the efforts of educators to reconstruct the curriculum to meet the interests and needs of students.

In its beginnings, the movement for the education of young people in family living developed no integrated programs; courses were planned more or less independently in different departments. The result was that in the first years this field of education developed along two distinct lines: child development, or, as it was then called, child care and training–representing the subject matter of psychology and health; and family life education, which concerned itself chiefly with a study of the history of family life, but sometimes included problems of relationship and adjustment within the family. Usually when the latter were included the approach was negative rather than positive.

In 1922, Professor Ernest R. Groves taught the first regular course on the family at Boston University. *Courses on the family: pioneering personalities and institutions.* The first real impetus to the study of problems of modern family life in schools and colleges was given by the work, teaching, and writing of Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer and Professor Ernest R. Groves. Due to the interest and vision of Dr. Benjamin R. Andrews, Professor of Household Economics at Teachers College, Columbia University, Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer was secured to lecture on "Social Problems of the Family" during the 1919 summer session of the College. So popular did these lectures prove that Mrs. Spencer continued to give them to successive groups of students for the next twelve years, and, at Dr. Andrews' urging, in 1923 she published *The Family and Its Members,* a book which incorporates much of the philosophy of family life expressed in her lectures, and which still serves as a valuable reference on problems of the family.

In 1924 Dr. Andrews secured Professor Ernest R. Groves to lecture at the summer term at the College, and for several consecutive summers Professor Groves continued his courses there. His book, *Social Problems of the Family,* which appeared in 1927, was the first college text which dealt with problems of modern family

life, and the problems of relationship and adjustment within the family. (The first college text on the family, entitled *A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution*, by Dr. Willystine Goodsell, had appeared in 1915). Many of those now working in the field of family life education had their first introduction to the study of the family in these summer courses with Mrs. Spencer and Professor Groves.

The introduction of a course in Euthenics into the Vassar College curriculum in 1923 was of special interest, for it was, in a sense, an admission that education for homemaking and parenthood might have some place in the curriculum of a woman's college.

The development of courses on the family in American colleges has been rapid. Nearly every senior college and university, many junior colleges, and a constantly increasing number of high schools provide such instruction. The importance of this attention to the family in the American educational program and the secure place it has in the curriculum appear in the giving over of the Yearbook for 1941 of the National Education Association to this interest. Marriage also has a larger place than formerly in courses on the family, and in addition to this many colleges and universities are offering practical but scientifically grounded courses in preparation for marriage.

The development of courses on marriage and the family has stimulated research which in turn has influenced social thinking. Instruction has drawn to a focus material concerning the family and marriage which is embedded in scientific material primarily dealing with other topics of research. Courses on the family and marriage have led to a more effective distribution of information of value to those who deal with personal problems and to those who direct or support a multitude of enterprises attempting to advance human welfare. This is especially noticeable in present trends in churches and in social agencies as they seek to deal more constructively with the values that gather about marriage and family life. In spite of this remarkable growth of interest, the family still, in view of its basic social significance, is relatively neglected. One evidence of this is the failure of legislators

to recognize family interests, as illustrated in their frequent disregard of the rights and needs of the consumer.

Legal thinking

Students of the family need always to keep in mind the great importance of domestic law. This expresses in both its statutory and common-law forms society's attempt to preserve and regulate the institutions of marriage and the family. Nevertheless, for the most part domestic law registers public opinion rather than contributes to the development of thought about the family. It is therefore chiefly significant in revealing the generally accepted domestic attitudes and standards of a particular time and place. It is usually, as we find it now in the United States, conservative and even backward, rather than a contribution to progressive thinking. In spite of this, its present form testifies that it slowly changes, as it follows after social thinking. It has traveled a great distance from the time when its fundamental purpose could be stated in the principle that marriage and the patriarchal family organization were designed in large measure to protect private property and to provide control of inheritance for the advantage of males.[38]

In the United States, no part of our legal system has moved forward more slowly than that concerned with marriage and the family. Its chief advances have been along the lines of equalizing the rights of husband and wife, of increasing the protection of mothers and children, of adding to the legal requirements for marriage, including demands for physical and mental fitness, and of attempting to deal more realistically with the problem of divorce, and with engagement. The movement of domestic legislation is toward the objectives listed by Vernier.[39]

[38] Willystine Goodsell, *A History of Marriage and the Family*, p. 317.
[39] C. G. Vernier, *American Family Laws* vol. 1, p. 18.

XXI. *The Future of the Family*

PERMANENCE OF FAMILIAL FUNCTIONING. The history of social thinking reveals that criticism of the family as a social institution and skepticism regarding the value of its functioning are in no sense modern. It would be strange indeed if so powerful an enterprise had not drawn the attention of critical thinkers and of reformers eager to reconstruct family life or to use it as an instrument to further some social enthusiasm. The privacy and relative independence associated with the household, the extraordinary emotional elements normally present in familial contact, the ease with which family experience if left to itself becomes stereotyped and traditional indicate that the family more than any other social institution needs critical appraisement and profits even from hostile attack.

Dissatisfactions and doubts concerning the family have been abundantly expressed in recent American thinking, possibly a decade ago even more than at present; and to many this has seemed a new social departure and in itself a demonstration of the precariousness of the family as a social institution. Contemporary social ills, like the pain of the body, so possess consciousness that it is difficult to make similar past experiences seem vivid. The record of former social discomforts, although accepted as a fact, remains detached from the emotions that give such warmth of feeling to immediate vexations. That this is true of the family tends to make the criticism it receives at any period appear more meaningful, to some even more ominous, than the echoes that come down from previous attacks on the functioning of the institution.

There is nothing to prophesy that the family will ever achieve a capacity of adaptation to human social need that will lift it to

such fulfillment of service as to close all openings to criticism or reform. Like all things human, denied finality it must always consist of exigency and expectation in process. There seems to be, and perhaps this has always been true, a mass feeling among the uncritical either that any indictment of the functioning of the family should be resented or the belief that, if it has to be accepted, this is an admission that the institution is moving toward extinction because of its failures or shrinkage. On the contrary, we cannot safely assume that periods of quiescence when the family seems stable and well received necessarily attest the security of the institution. Instead, the absence of flaw-finding may be due not to the efficiency of the family as a social institution, but to indifference or to the barrier that has been erected against any adverse judgment, while on the other hand a period marked by the quantity of critical attention the family is receiving may be the result of greater sensitiveness in the general social consciousness to long-tolerated malpractice, either within the family or outside.

It is not safe, therefore, to attempt to measure the working of the family as a social institution by the amount of criticism it receives or escapes. This does reveal the attitude felt toward the family at the time but affords no index as to whether the family is carrying on its functions with much or little success. Moreover, in any attempt to get at this reaction, a distinction must be made between the feeling of those who are especially intellectual and scrutinizing and those who represent more docile habits of thought. In trying to estimate the importance as well as the amount of criticism the family is receiving, it must be borne in mind that criticism easily becomes a self-producing influence. A critical age, for example, produces a censorious disposition which may be directed against the family as well as against other social organizations.

Criticism of the family also engenders, at least for a time, a repetition of assaults which are evidences of the passing of suggestion from person to person rather than of marked ineffectiveness in the adaptation of the institution. Personal dissatis-

faction, whatever its source, if it pours forth in some impressive and penetrating form will stir in others a similar reaction. The situation is rarely, if ever, so simple that faulty adjustments of the family to social need are immediately and proportionately reflected in criticism directed to the cause of trouble. Moreover, there is a past and present to complicate the situation. The existing maladjustment which results from the family's being out of step with human need may not uncover its failure until at a later time those who have been hurt disclose their misfortune. This is especially true when the fault of the family has to do with its influences upon the growing personality of the child. Similarly, when criticism comes because of the family's malpractices in the past, it may not be realized how the institution has changed during the period of time that has since elapsed.

Above all, it is imperative that the social adaptation of the family be not judged by its stability. The latter may represent a stationary moment in the flow of culture in a family experience maintained by formula and tradition. It requires a discrimination rarely given to one living within such a period to see that it is not adjustment but arrest that characterizes the family that flourishes in contentment while at the same time failing to make the contribution that later is seen to have been necessary to conserve human welfare. The ineptitude of the family may be not only concealed but socially approved and even cultivated. Social acquiescence, however, will not lessen its liabilities, but it may make the institution seem adaptive and effective when in fact it is failing to carry on its proper function.

One certainty remains in this confusion, and that is the inevitability of trouble coming sooner or later if the family as an institution does not effectively adjust itself to the needs of its members on the one hand and to the demands of the social environment on the other. The actual adjustment has to be made in individual households, each presenting a complexity of circumstances that stands apart from all others in its uniqueness. It is the dissatisfactions of families that we attempt to catalogue as the instability of the institution; it is the failure to function on

the part of individual homes that leads us to indict the institution for its imperfect functioning. Our massive criticisms are abstract and, however faithful in interpreting widespread familial conditions, do not suggest the great variation that at any time of appraisal may be found in the particular family experiences. This fact makes comparison between past and present criticisms of the family difficult.

Criticism of the family moves along two lines. One is directed against the significance it has for those who make up its membership, the other against its social contribution. Both types often include an assault upon the orthodox form, that is, the structure that contemporary family life takes. Fundamentally, all criticism takes for granted the persistency of the essential function that the domestic institution in all ages and under all conditions has possessed, since racial continuity forbids any surrender of this indispensable feature of the parent-child relationship. Criticism is pointed rather at the domestic development that has come forth from this biologically imposed prerequisite for human survival. The persistence, therefore, of the essential social task of the family is assumed in all serious discussions of familial problems.

This acceptance of a domestic function does not preclude, however, advocacy of radical changes in the construction of the institution that assumes the obligation that the human infancy period brings society; nor should it be allowed to prejudice any suggestion for reshaping the activities of the family. Neither structure nor function can be protected from criticism by the fact that in some way society must manage to continue the domestic function, but any discussion becomes futile that does not assume the persistency through some sort of organization of the racial service out of which domesticity has developed.

The future of the family

If the question, "What is to be the future of the family?" means whether it is to continue, the answer must be that it is as secure as the human race itself. Man's extinction is conceivable

either because of decisive adverse changes in environment or an incapacity that makes the adaptations necessary for human survival impossible. In either case, deterioration of the family must accompany the passing of the race. So long as the generations of mankind come and go, there must be the perpetuation, in some form, of familial activities and values, since there is nothing to indicate that the evolutionary process can go into reverse and gradually wipe out the extension of the infancy period which gave man his opportunity and his culture. If, however, such a backward movement were to occur, the disappearing of the qualities characteristic of man would keep pace with the lessening of the infancy period. Thus the destiny of the family and of the human race are inseparably tied together so far as the future is concerned, but this gives us no certainty that change of the one is necessarily and proportionately reflected in the other. Such changing, however, cannot mean any tendency toward the extinction of the basic traits of either without moving toward the obliteration of both.

Neither the form nor the operation of the family is protected from change by the fact that the institution has taken over functions indispensable to human survival. Because of this there cannot be certainty as to the future structure of the institution that assumes the responsibilities of domesticity, or regarding the way it will carry on its activities and the satisfactions it will attempt to furnish. Safe prophecy would require a foresight as to the progress of civilization that is denied the most intelligent of investigators, for even the trends that can be charted at the moment are, when looked at in the light of their meaning in the ongoing of human culture, insignificant. They are at best matters of tomorrow that carry us only a short distance beyond today, and even then invite caution since any interpretation of social movement is likely to be clouded by the survey-maker's attachment to the present.

This fact does not discount the usefulness of such attempts to trace social trends, because fortunately for practical purposes and values they are concerns of today and tomorrow. The

meaning of such findings, however, must not be forced beyond its area of time when applied to the family and used to determine the future of the institution. Only in the narrow sense of future has such tracing either reliability or relevancy. The student of the family is no freer to slip through the barriers of time than any other scientist. His knowledge is not only limited; it is also temporary. Unless he disciplines himself in his attempts at foretelling, he is certain to mistake transitional changing for deterioration, or use moments of familial instability as opportunities for partisan and wishful interpretation.

The complexity of family changes

That area of personal and social interest that is covered by the concept "family" is highly complex. Both in structure and in function it represents an amalgamation. It is complex, indeed, in two senses. As an abstraction, it represents innumerable differing individual families, each with a significance that is, for those who compose it, unique and that cannot be abstracted and brought under any classifying concept. The family is complex also in that it contains a wide range of activities and values that represent an alliance, perhaps better, a gathering of various distinctive interests about that central core which we can best describe as domesticity. Any discussion of the future of the family requires the isolation of the most common of these affinities in order that analysis may deal with each separately.

In such an effort it is necessary to keep in mind that the amalgamation has been made possible by the extension of parent-child feeling and interest and the fact that this spread has meant an extension of the time element of domesticity, a deepening of the feeling element, and an enlarging of the meaning of familial relationship both to the person and to society. Each of these expanses has been made possible by the resources of memory and imagination provided by human evolution, and the union of these processes with the emotions. This means that the complex that the family represents is not just a quantitative addition of dif-

ferent functions, but also an accretion of qualities in the strictest sense; and that the threefold expansion of each in time, in intensity, and in meaning operates both quantitatively and qualitatively upon the other specific interests that have combined to form the modern family as we know it. As the infancy period has grown in cultural meaning, it has established a cultural nucleus about which have gathered allied but also distinctive developments of human interest. This makes the family, when taken in its fullest sense, an institution whose frontiers it is difficult to fix.

The sexual element of the family complex

Sex is one of the specific centers of interest that human and social evolution have allied with domesticity. It is needless to say that sex in its various aspects is not necessarily tied up with either marriage or the family even though there has been a marked and, it would seem, an increasing consolidation. Our present social achievement, however, does not indicate any continuous progressive evolution in the sense of a consistent advance, for even in simple primitive groups there have been in some instances amalgamations similar to our own. The massive movement, however, has been toward placing sex in its most meaningful expression within marriage and, as a consequence, uniting it to the family complex. The alliance has never been complete, and the resistance of the sexual impulse to social coercion, its expression in individualistic independence, has been emphasized in fiction and the drama. The persistence of prostitution is also explained in part by the difficulty society has always encountered in any effort to place sex interest entirely within the domestic realm, especially when this has rested upon the monogamic form of marriage.

These oppositions to and escapes from the standards that attempt to confine sex to the domestic relationship are less significant than the fact that society keeps them unorthodox and persists in maintaining the sex-family alliance as the approved

code of conduct. Even when prostitution and other forms of illicit sexual behavior are widely and complacently tolerated, they are never more than variations from the socially supported standard. They, therefore, never reach the point where they indicate a social rebellion, a replacement of the conventional social goals by ideals contrary to those that rest upon the notion of the need of consolidating sex and the family.

The past cannot be used to guarantee the future in the realm of sex any more than it can in any other sphere of human interest, but the movement that has brought and that maintains this union of family and sex makes it reasonable to suppose that whatever changes come in the social attitude toward sex or in sexual practices the alliance will continue. Contemporary events, however, as they are related to sex interests indicate that the alliance as it is conventionally defined at present is being disturbed and is likely to be more so on account of changes in process. In the sexual area the most significant of these changes, the one that would appear to have in the long run the greatest influence upon man's feeling and thinking about sex, is the piling up of evidence in the field of medicine that sexual experience has in itself positive value for the organism in both its physiological and psychological aspects. Especially is it being made clear that in both the male and female, sex contributes something more than reproduction because it is organically included within the endocrine system and therefore by nature's decree has a significance that is independent of the purpose it plays in the reproductive scheme. The social taboo that has so long been a barrier against the investigating of sex in the spirit with which science has done its searching elsewhere is breaking down; and because of this, discoveries are taking place rapidly, especially in medicine, that are forcing intelligent people to regard sex more seriously than they ever have in times past and to recognize the meaning it has for both body and mind.

Society has long been familiar with the attacks that have come from the individual sex impulse and that have been directed against the standards imposed by the alliance of sex and family.

The fact that these assaults have appeared as the resistance of individuals to the socially approved code has taken from them much of their power to disturb the existing union of sex and domesticity. Much of this assault could be dismissed as either selfishness, immaturity, morbid aberration, or even chronic anti-social disposition. The monogamic ideal, drawing its vitality from group welfare, in contrast with such behavior stood all the stronger as the ideal form of sexual relationship. Along with this commitment to monogamy there has been some slight recognition, it must be said in fairness, of the loss of comradeship and of satisfaction that falls upon those individuals who have been denied opportunity to enter matrimony and establish family life.

The fact, however, that science is uncovering the significance of sex in itself as a contribution to the normal functioning of mind and body gives a much more serious meaning to the fact that the monogamic form of marriage and society's attempt to keep sex satisfaction within the family consolidation bring a denial of sex life to many persons and a stress period to many others who have matured and yet for various reasons cannot marry. The fact that this may not become conscious, but may remain something unrecognized by the individual, is beside the point. Self-concealment or sublimation may protect the individual from full realization of the influences of his sexual situation. Both the losses and the stress can be greatly magnified, and either in fact may bring less conflict to the sensitive person at present than any attempt to regard sex as a private concern and to refuse to subscribe to the social thinking that insists that it be expressed only within the alliance that has gathered about family interests.

The significance of the knowledge that is being gathered regarding the complexities of sex is that it challenges the very consolidation that supports the orthodox ideal. Undoubtedly it will encourage a cleavage between regard for sex as a thing in itself which contemplates no consequences beyond itself, and regard for it as a first step in the development that ends in offspring and parenthood. This distinction, which attempts to

withdraw from the family area much of sex conduct that society has determined should be approved only within it, is encouraged by the popularizing and increasing of the efficacy of modern contraception. The newness of this situation can also be exaggerated, but in degree at least the onslaught coming from the recognition of the biologic value of sex, aside from its place in the reproductive system, and from the demand for individual freedom in sex conduct is greater than in any other period known to us.

The backwardness of medical science, its long acceptance of the social taboo that has led it relatively to ignore sex, adds to the confusion of the moment and makes the future the more uncertain. Nothing reveals the social retardation that has limited a scientific investigation of sex so much as the reluctance of doctors entrusted with man's preventive and curative program in the field of physical well-being to recognize with the seriousness it deserves one of the major biological facts of human existence. The result is that we are left without a knowledge that the progress of medicine along other lines would make us expect concerning the present cleavage between sex structure as it functions in intercourse, and as it operates as a part of the endocrine system.

If this separation remains as organically definite as one would gather from the present findings of medicine, science will contribute much less to the pressure against the prevailing monogamic code than if investigation leads to an increasing emphasis on the reciprocity of influence between the two aspects of sex. An endocrine specialist tells us that morality has not yet, at any rate, been successfully reduced to chemistry.[1] In the future, it is also safe to say, it is not likely to be made merely a matter of physiology. It is equally safe, however, to predict that an increasing understanding of the meaning of human sex in its largest sense will come forth from medical and biological research and that it will influence the thinking and feeling of people

[1] R. G. Hoskins, *The Tides of Life*, p. 111.

regarding sex and thereby the social code. It is impressive at least to find an investigator insisting that a case of schizophrenia —dementia praecox in our older vocabulary—is never seen in which a normal heterosexual development has been achieved. Such a statement suggests on how wide a front experimental science is certain in years to come to wrestle with problems of human sex.[2]

In view of what has already happened and what seems likely to happen on account of this beginning of serious investigations of sex, it does not seem possible that the code of conduct can any longer be supported effectively by taboo or maintained by traditional mores. The alternative is a self-conscious, intelligent program for the regulation of behavior that will never be without social consequences and therefore cannot be left freely to the decision of the individual. The workings of human nature do not justify anyone's expecting, at least in the near future, a code of conduct constructed by deliberation based upon the findings of uncoerced science, but any approach toward this in the sphere of human sex will be a social innovation in sharp contrast to the treatment sex has received for centuries. There is much at present that prophesies that essential progress will be made, indeed is being made, in the development of a more intelligent attitude toward all sex problems through a self-conscious examination of human experience that is relatively new. Certainly sex must be taken more seriously not only by medicine, but by education, ethics, and religion. This greater attention will not merely be the product of necessity in the attempt to conserve childhood and youth, but will also come from an increasing conviction of the importance of the positive contributions of sex to the career of the adult.

At the moment there is some evidence, judging from the behavior of a portion of American youth and a lesser group of the married, of a tendency to interpret sex experience with two different degrees of meaning, justifying intercourse outside the

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

husband-wife relationship, but denying the same freedom within the family consolidation. The attempt of Judge Lindsey to legalize the attitude of the first group by his advocacy of what he termed "the companionate marriage," misusing and spoiling the concept given us by Dr. Knight, met with no response because it was out of accord with the purposes of those who were demanding a more liberal practice in sex. Their program was based upon the belief that sex outside the family-complex should be free, a matter for personal decision and responsibility. To give such sex relations legal recognition not only meant removing the freedom that was their essential quality but also elevating them to an emotional commitment that was reserved for marriage. The logic behind their attitude was of course not self-conscious. They merely reacted with the feeling that naturally grew out of their disposition toward sexual practices. Their conduct was not merely the consequence of their inability for financial or other reasons to marry, but came from a view of sex that distinguished practices that are mere pleasure-giving outside the family complex from those that have a decidedly different significance through the mutual affection expressed in the husband-wife relationship.

It is of the greatest import that those who insist that sex should be released from the restrictions of the familial code are themselves convinced that sex takes on a different quality when it becomes the intimacy of husband and wife. There appears to be no disposition on the part of those who are seeking to repudiate the present, conventional code to consider out-of-marriage relationships as equal in meaning to those that conform to the socially supported standards. Instead, they defend their position by insisting that their freer type of relationship is inferior to that constituting a marriage and therefore should not be regarded as a rival. The issue, therefore, that these advocates of a new code bring is not whether human evolution can be forced backward and the affectionate commitment that has come with the ideal of human mating be severed from sex, but rather what effect on the stability and meaning of this higher form of

sex expression a socially accepted code of freedom before marriage, or freedom after marriage according to the Bertrand Russell scheme, will have.

In any attempt to peer into the future through the use of present trends in sex conduct as they affect the familial alliance, it is necessary to keep in mind the limitation of sex that its narrow meaning carries. Whatever its contributions to the body may prove to be, intercourse has meager meaning to all except those living very close to an animal level unless it ties itself up with emotional and psychic qualities that provide the expansion which expresses itself best in affection. Here, it seems, must be found the chief support of the monogamic ideal. Fundamentally, it is a standard imposed by human sex itself, an achievement that perhaps most of all measures the distance we have traveled through cultural evolution from our original animal inheritance. To keep pace with the growth and meaning of human life along other lines of development physical sex, which has decided limitations when denied psychic extension, needed to have the emotional opportunity for enrichment which love provides. This consolidation of sex and affection was annexed to the core of the family complex, and whatever competition it must face in the future from a lesser form of sex, its dominance seems secure.

The record of human behavior, as it is known to us, offers nothing to support the idea that sex conduct will ever become so free as to leave the socially approved individual unconstrained. If the most liberal programs of past experience give any indication of the future, society must maintain some sort of code, and this means that no individual will be left entirely to his own inclinations. The social significance of sex is not something arbitrary or artificial but an inherent consequence of its human development as contrasted with the animal; and, in view of this importance of sex, no society can surrender its interest in individual conduct. There is, therefore, no promise that the future will solve the sex problem even though it may lessen the strain by a more open and understanding attitude. Sex is such a com-

pound of physical, psychic, and social elements that it cannot be dealt with successfully unless it be lifted to the higher rather than left on the lower level; and this means the intrusion of emotional and social reactions that forbid that sex be treated exclusively as a physical impulse. This refusal, which is itself a cultural growth, to leave sex on its original plane as a mere body appetite means that social control, strain, and sublimation, in some measure and in some form, will continue.

In any attempt to forecast how much sex strain will be characteristic of the future, why it will be established, and how it will affect individual and social life, it is needful that one keep in mind not only the ebb and flow of cultural change, but also the length of time that, even in these days of rapid happenings, is required before any clear, consistent outcome can be defined. Unwin insists that under the conditions that have hitherto prevailed an extension or limitation of sex practices, either in society itself or within some special class, cannot reveal in fullness its cultural effects for a hundred years.[3] The same author is led by his investigation of primitive and historic societies to the conviction that not only are societies determined in their display of social energy by their amount of sexual limitation, which reaches its highest point in the adoption of absolute monogamy,[4] but that the ruling classes in highly developed societies lose their position through adoption of a more liberal code, which if it brings less strain to the individual also results in loss of social energy.[5]

Human sex, like other individualistic impulses, easily becomes a cause of tension between the person and the group. An indifferent public opinion can remove constraint, putting an end to any strain that might come through a conflict of the individual with the group. The simplicity of this appeals to those who for one reason or another have become keenly conscious of the burden that the orthodox monogamic code has always imposed, at least in theory. This reconstruction of social attitude, how-

[3] J. D. Unwin, *Sex and Culture*, p. 326.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 382.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 368-432.

ever, can never be as simple as at first it seems because it can never be so detached from the total social experience as the critics of existing regulations assume. Struggle is inherent in all biological experience. This may easily be excessive, and survival chances are often enhanced by lightening the load the organism or the species is carrying. There comes a time, however, when easy circumstances strike at the capacity of the organism to maintain necessary struggle. The hazard of this shows most clearly in the parasite.

The biological fact that all struggle cannot be safely eliminated holds true for human as well as for animal life. This appears in every fundamental line of activity, and the sexual is no exception. There is, therefore, a deeper question than whether the individual should be free from sex strain resulting from an inhibiting code or whether such a program can be accepted by the social group without great loss of moral values; and that is, whether sex itself can maintain the richness evolution has given it unless it also brings to human nature a degree of struggle even though this means for the individual tension that freedom could remove. This question arises especially in the career of the adolescent. The social code can be thought of as something arbitrarily and outwardly imposed, but attacks upon the value of sex as a human experience and as a contribution to domesticity that follow any attempt to make it a mere physiological relief or pleasure are not something externally determined but an effect due to the nature of sex itself. It is this, probably, that explains the reaction that so quickly follows periods of loose sexual code. Licentiousness gives way to puritanism not only in the life of a Tolstoy and a St. Augustine, but in the social group itself. Sexual softness is as biologically detrimental as any other softness that comes from loss of the necessity and, in time, of the ability to struggle. This principle cannot be invoked in order to prevent any changing of the sex code, but it cannot be safely forgotten by anyone seeking to chart the future of sex practices.

The principle appears again as it affects the practice of divorce. The justification of the right to dissolve a marriage comes from

the inherent difficulties of domestic adjustment and the unwillingness of the group to ask individuals to carry the burden of an intolerable mating. This recognition of the need of relief for the individual sooner or later comes in conflict with the insistence on the part of the group that the meaning of marriage and its social integrity be maintained. We can have on the one side easy divorce, which leaves everything to individual inclination; or on the other, a group coercion that insists that individuals make the best of the hardest circumstances.

Modern society is seeking to compromise these two, but again liberality cannot proceed to the point that removes all domestic strain, since this strikes at the significance of marriage. A degree of struggle must be maintained here, or again human nature will lose more than it gains by easy circumstances. The compromise is as difficult as any in the entire field of social life. In this country it is vividly pictured at present by the contrasting divorce policies of Nevada and South Carolina. The greater national attitude lies between these two extremes, seeking to open a way of relief to the oppressed individual without destroying the value that comes to marriage by making it a struggle that disciplines the individuals concerned.

Whatever the future divorce program may be, the danger of exploiting marriage itself will force some degree of constraint over individualistic inclination. It seems reasonable to expect that this attitude will show itself at least in an unwillingness to allow individuals to be married and divorced again and again. This recently was the reaction in Russia to the consequences of a very liberal divorce code. Public opinion grows more and more hostile to those who are repeatedly married and divorced. Such careers make the headlines in the newspapers because of this resentment. The group cannot tolerate such ostentatious advertising of lack of capacity for genuine marriage, since in its attack upon the idea of marriage it is more upsetting than any form of stable polygamy. It is safe to venture that repressive legislation will be passed and enforced, substantially backed by public opinion, denying marriage to those who have several

times sought divorce. The common suggestion at present is that the right to marry be withheld after the third divorce. It is not so important where the line be drawn as that in some practical way public opinion find means to register its unwillingness to have matrimony exploited. This does not mean that society is eager to penalize those who fail in marriage, but rather that it is determined to protect the institution, the attitude being similar to that taken toward the reckless driver who again and again wrecks his automobile on a public highway.

The economic element of the family complex

Sociological investigators have made two things clear with reference to the economic aspects of the family. There is compelling evidence of the great part economic interests have played in the development of the complex which we know as the family. It is also clear that of late family functioning as an economic unit has declined in significance. One of the most impressive illustrations of the first is the account of Malinowski as he describes a primitive people insisting that the father, for economic reasons, assume certain responsibilities for the protection of mother and offspring even when there appears to be no knowledge of the physical facts of fatherhood.[6] A realization of the lessening of the economic significance of the family, at least in the sense of a co-operating, producing unit, followed the advent of the industrial revolution; and, in our time, the recognition of this loss on the part of the family has become one of the most commonly accepted findings of recent social science.

It cannot be said, however, that the modern family is less influenced by economic motivation. On the contrary, there is much evidence that it is being more conditioned by such considerations than ever in the past. The time of marriage is for many individuals greatly influenced by problems of income and expenditure. Parenthood, likewise, shows reaction to similar

[6] *The Father in Primitive Psychology*, pp. 82-85.

influences. For an increasing number of people in the more highly developed civilizations, the questions whether one is to be a parent, and if so, when, and how often, are matters very greatly determined by economic motives. This greater sensitiveness of the family to economic circumstances does not indicate pressure of poverty but rather, and this makes its social solution the more difficult, that human expectation runs ahead of an advancing standard of life when economic resources move upward, with the consequence that there is commonly a sense of poverty subjectively determined, or at least the feeling of an inadequate opportunity for marriage and parenthood. The general trend in America has been toward the lifting of the standard of living, but this has been more than overshadowed by a still greater elevation in the desires that have found expression in economic demand. If the problem were merely getting people out of poverty, increased production could be depended upon to bring a solution that would lessen the need of delay of marriage, at least for economic reasons, and any restriction of offspring for the same motive. When, however, the more significant factor is the passing of the economic complacency associated with a static content and in its place an expansion of economic desires stimulated by an industrial organization of society that can live only by this acquisitiveness, the situation as it affects the family becomes supremely difficult.

There has been a decided about-face. The economic part of the familial complex worked as a whole during the period in which household production prevailed to strengthen the family as an institution. Although it would be an overstatement to say that the family at present is devoid of all economic functioning merely because for so many income depends upon the gaining of wages outside the home, it is true that the institution has not yet become so adjusted to its radical reversal of function that it is as stable as before. Economic activities that once contributed to the domesticity that rested upon a common productive interest among the members of the family have been replaced by conditions that emphasize the consuming aspects of the household.

This would be less true if there were full regard for the value of the services of the housewife and mother. Taken by itself, the economic component of the amalgamation seems rather a tension-making than a support-bringing constituent of the familial alliance, even to the point where domesticity and economic ambition struggle against each other in competition instead of working together in co-operation.

We shall be led astray in our thinking if we assume that economic stress is entering the family complex for the first time. In the sense of having means of subsistence under normal conditions, aside from floods, earthquakes, the temporary breaking down of transportation, war, and the like, modern man, in spite of glaring exceptions to the general rule, is far better placed than were his predecessors, and the maintenance of the family more secure. Even a vivid imagination cannot take us back to former times so that we can realize the feeling of parents who found themselves unable to furnish their children even the bare necessities of life. The studies of the Hammonds,[7] in which they try to retrace in city and country the conditions in which the great mass of working people found themselves at the beginning of the industrial revolution, reveal domestic suffering due to economic deficiency and insecurity. It is now the pressure of economic need above the level of mere subsistence and the adverse influence this has upon domesticity that constitute our present problem and complicate the future of marriage and the family.

The situation is more confused because of a fundamental change in the social status of the sexes. The importance of this is generally recognized. It has been studied in much detail and constitutes a social problem in itself. It is clear that woman, where modern culture flows without political interference, has reached unprecedented near-equality with man in out-of-the-family self-expression, and that this not only has brought a greater financial independence but is itself in large measure a

[7] J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Town Labourer.*

result of an economic opportunity which necessarily makes her an economic rival of man. This is nowhere more evident than in the United States, where culture is relatively young. Many influences have contributed to bringing this about—the democratic trend, the frontier experience, the rebellion against the dominance of Europe, the escape from rigid class distinctions, and the fact that the American people were fortunate enough to avoid a single or dominant ecclesiastical control because the religious freedom, which was not only legally but socially maintained, encouraged the formation of many church groups, all forced in some degree to respond to the democratic disposition of the population.

Invention, the organization of industry, and the rapid progress in settling and exploiting the land opened up new opportunity for woman, but only as she left the household and as a wage earner entered the world so long dominated by man. The effect of this in changing the quality of domesticity has again and again been discussed by students of marriage and the family. The results of woman's working outside the home need now to be taken into account in any discussion of marriage and the family. But a possible consequence that concerns us in any attempt to look forward to the future of our domestic institutions is the effect of this in encouraging economic expectation in women, and the influence of this expectation upon human mating, the bearing of children, and the development of unity within the household.

Individual inclination and individual situations direct the new opportunity of women not only toward different but also opposite results. Thus, a woman may hesitate to marry because she is unwilling to lose her economic independence, or she may work because this makes her marriage possible; she may deny herself motherhood because she cannot afford or is unwilling to surrender her out-of-the-family occupation, or she may seek to augment the income of her husband because only so can they afford children. The one thing that can safely be said is that woman's present economic status is a basic element because it

affects the quality of the modern home, and a factor that has to be understood in any analysis of an individual home.

We cannot assume that woman will advance still closer to equality with man, or even maintain the position that she has reached in the freest expressions of our Western culture. Difficult as it is for the American to conceive of a movement backward, the fact is that already there is in evidence such a tendency. There is no doubt, however, that woman cannot enjoy full self-expression and hold her present achievement of individuality unless she is socially permitted, if she so chooses, to enter without artificial handicap income-bringing occupations outside the home. Even though only a minority of women exercise this privilege, and a smaller number seek it by preference, the fact that there is such a provision of economic activity is indispensable if modern civilization is to continue to respect the individuality of woman.

Meanwhile our interpretations of the economic interests that have gathered about the family must recognize the significance of the division of labor on a sex basis and the significance of woman's status. Freud tells us that civilization is clashing with family interests represented chiefly by women, who naturally tend toward the appreciation of domesticity.[8] The dividing influence of modern life cuts still deeper than this. It not only makes possible a struggle between the family and cultural trends, it even demands within the family a reconstruction of the domestic program, since otherwise husband and wife themselves clash in their family association. Any argument that builds itself upon the mere femaleness of the woman cannot grapple with present domestic problems. It is not only the woman as contrasted with the female, but the new woman socially and recently constructed that must be reckoned with in the building of a domestic philosophy.

The clashing that does indeed exist between the family and civilization, between the home with its stress of individuality

[8] *Civilization and Its Discontents*, p. 73.

and society with its massive social coercion, is even more significantly duplicated in the personal life-career of the sensitive modernized woman. She is by no means entirely on the side of the family, as would be true if only her biological endowment influenced her thinking and feeling. Built upon her femaleness, there is now, if she has partaken of modern culture, an elaborate, culturally organized experience and expectation which constitute a substantial part of her personality. Only by demodernizing her can she be made the original female type, emotionally able to concentrate on home and children. Even if recent achievements have dislodged her from her proper biological sphere and overwhelmed her with burdens that time will disclose, it is difficult to see how the woman problem can be solved by forcing her back to an earlier status. Instead of this, there must be some sort of readjustment which will permit her domestic interests to be expressed without compromising her individuality as a human being. She cannot live in the modern world and be exclusively domestic, a superior servant type, or even an adequate modern mother.

It looks as if social evolution must protect the family on a level of more intricate relationships than have formerly been provided by division of labor of the sexes, and in large measure this means greater and more practical recognition by society of the economic aspects of domesticity. Those who look wishfully backward seeking to define woman as we find her on the biological plane must keep in mind that culture tends to be accumulative, stimulating the very demands that are necessary for its preservation. Not only are women likely to wish to remain modern, but man must also be stripped of much of the results of his own cultural experience before he can be led to seek for his wife and the mother of his children a more primitive type of womanhood.

Recent depressions seem to have been unprecedented in the influence they have had in creating the demand for economic security. The strength of this craving cannot be appreciated unless it be related to the family. The emotions that domesticity

has achieved, expressed in love between the spouses and between parents and children, are making the feeling of economic insecurity unbearable to the modern man and woman. However they view their situation consciously, for a great multitude the depth of their seeking for economic security is to be explained by feelings that come forth from early family experience and are expressed a second time within a family-setting. The unbearableness of economic hazard gathers its intensity from emotions that drain from the childhood need of security and that relive in the adult's desire to know that husband or wife and children are economically secure. The depressions have so destroyed confidence, so brought into doubt protections that tradition has transmitted as economic axioms, that modern man is getting desperate for some sort of safe anchorage and is willing to pay a price for it that only recently he could not have been led even to consider. Now he seeks from some source and by some social organization assurance that the basic impulses and cravings fostered by the influences of domesticity are economically invulnerable from the changing circumstances that of late have made him helpless. No social system is safe that ignores the depth of this feeling which demands in the modern world an insurance which in primitive life was achieved by tribal co-operation. Until this is forthcoming, the domestic complex in its economic aspects will continue to show an instability that must issue in a great many divergent problems. The future of the family as a social institution along the line of its economic interests appears to depend on the ability of society to furnish something extraordinarily difficult to supply—the sense of economic security demanded by people whose wants travel far beyond a subsistence level and who emotionally recoil when the values that have come to seem indispensable to them as they have awakened to the possibilities of human life appear precarious not only for themselves but for their children.

It is difficult also to see how society can itself be secure unless there is a deliberate cultural effort to do more than merely cater to the economic needs and demands of future men and women.

Desires are so quick to respond to any increase of satisfaction that a feeling of economic insufficiency seems likely to continue even under the most favorable conditions of the production and distribution of material wealth. To attain social stability it must be the task of a conserving culture to help human nature to appreciate and to cultivate nonmaterial values. Satisfactions that are independent of consumption or possession of material goods offer an antidote for a materialistic philosophy of life which inherently contains the roots of its own discontent. The fact that family interests and civilization do already collide indicates where society must go to find its richest opportunity for the building of a greater balance between inner and outer possessions. A strong family life, the product of readiness to take on domesticity, seems indispensable not only to the contentment but to the survival of man. Economic motivation needs to be more firmly amalgamated in the familial complex and moderated by a more common realization of the values that can be achieved only in the realm of relationship.

Although the future economic evolution greatly concerns both the structure and the functioning of the family in time to come, we have no means of foretelling what is to be. The tracing of present trends, great value as this has for the understanding of present problems and those of the immediate future, becomes inconclusive when used to chart the course of events for any distance in the future. That there is to be no economic change of importance to the family seems, in the light of the past, unthinkable. Even if there were to be no substantial shift in the form of our economic and political systems, there are sure to be changes from what now prevails that must seriously affect family life.

The history of England, and even the briefer history of the United States, demonstrates that without any outward reconstruction of government there can be vast inner changes of importance to the domestic institutions. The same possibility becomes the clearer when the evolution of economic life is traced. The family must respond to these changes that take

place whether they be in the organization, or merely in the working, of the economic and political systems. It can also be expected to maintain, in spite of such variation, characteristics that are largely independent of its external environment, essential traits that it must possess in order to continue its survival purposes. Whatever happens, our present political and economic organizations will seek to enlist the support of the family, which in some measure they must have, or their duration will be brief.

The opportunity the family provides for individuality must always be a potential menace to any existing economic or political dominance, and in the proportion that such a type of civilization antagonizes individuality, the independence of the family must be expected to have its ups and downs. At times crushed to feeble resistance, it may be expected in other periods to offer substantial resistance to social pressure from whatever quarter. The complexity of modern social life, however, seems likely always to make the task of the family in preserving individuality difficult. There will be a considerable strain, lightly felt by the group but more heavily by the individual. Even though this prophesies discomfort for the sensitive, thoughtful person and will lessen a smooth working of any civilization, it is the price that must be paid if personal integrity, the proper goal of human evolution, is to be maintained. The human species is not adapted to the ant-hill civilization, but its chief protection from such an exploitation of its distinctive endowment must always be the domestic institution, which possesses a vigorous antidote in the parent-child relationship.

The success of the family in building its prophylactic against an overemphasis of society as compared with the individual means that many men and women will in their own personal experience feel the tension between desires for fulfillment stimulated by home contacts and the wish to be in perfect accord with the demands of the group prevailing at the moment. This will be freely expressed or disguised and repressed according to the strength of social pressure. Individuals will react differently to the situation; the family, however, unless destroyed in some

such way as Plato suggested, will continue to keep alive the desire for self-expression which is the source of social variation and progress. The threshold of the home will always be the greatest barrier to aggressive *isms* or organized tyranny.

The companionship element of the family complex

The gregarious impulses that we find among animals are replaced in the human being by a more variable desire for comradeship. Like other human motivations, it is open to social conditioning and is, as a rule, greatly influenced and intensified by the contacts of the child with other members of the household. Spontaneously, and as a by-product of its activities, the family becomes a nursery for companionship impulses. The home does not merely prepare the individual for later social relationships; it also builds an inner disposition for intimate relationships. Attitudes toward life are fostered that create a feeling of loneliness when one is denied emotional satisfaction in one's associations. The mere being with others, or even successfully getting on with others, does not bring fulfillment if the craving for comradeship has not been, by some misfortune, aborted. This hunger for intimate response may not be a family product but something akin to the instinct of the animal, but it finds early expression within the family circle; and then at maturity becomes an objective for marriage and family relationships.

The human incentives that lead toward a special fellowship, although they take various forms of expression of which friendship is one of the most important, also furnish an element in the familial complex. This third constituent of the domestic amalgamation is becoming more important and to some extent is replacing the losses associated with the family's surrender of its co-operative, productive functioning. In its supreme expression, we designate it as affection. Actually, the love that leads to the husband-wife relationship is not the mere refining and enlarging of this need of comradeship, for the erotic desires

have a large place in love. This means, however, that we have to recognize that two of the elements of domesticity combine and, when isolated from the others, constitute what we describe as love. The expression of sex has already been described. Distinctive in this process is the addition of a sense of comradeship that changes even the quality of sex intercourse, lifting it not only above the animal level but giving it opportunity for enrichment radically changing its significance. Sex relations devoid of this element or weak in this constituent are perhaps the most illusory of all human drives. Powerful and persistent, they are nevertheless disappointing, even followed almost immediately when passion is exhausted by depression or disgust.

The family naturally furnishes the child his first opportunity to start the development that leads him toward the need of comradeship. His being with others who give him when he is so impressionable some measure of fellowship begins the conditioning that goes on throughout childhood. It is not all a direct gift of familial association, but even so it is largely a series of environmental influences that the family makes possible and manipulates. One of these sources that are not necessarily within the family but under the control of the family is the play the child has with other children. His play impulse represents another line of personality development, but it has as a by-product personal relationships that influence the growth of the desire for comradeship. Commonly there is a degree of contact between the families whose children play together, and this gives each child an early access to a different intimate union from that which he has shared as a member of his own household. The tie between the children, which contains companionship in elemental form, brings an awareness and, as a rule, a sympathy with a second family organization which frequently is also fortunate enough in the meaning it has to the child drawn within it to serve him as a secondary familial conditioning.

The impulse very quickly travels beyond the confines of the family as the child enters the wider area of experience. His entrance upon school launches him into this greater area,

although even then he is likely to get his chief contacts that continue his development from one or two much preferred friends. This craving for special intimacy furnishes one of the bridges by which the individual crosses into social consciousness. As maturity advances, the craving becomes more definite and more conscious. With the coming of adolescence, it is normally turned toward a member of the opposite sex and is reinforced by erotic impulses, forming a union in which the two elements are so fused that neither appears separately in consciousness.

Overwhelming as these drives for a personal response easily become, they are not exclusive since comradeship is sought in other relationships. Although maturity normally brings a concentration of affection leading to marriage, it is still true that comradeship between the sexes ordinarily cannot be confined to even the most satisfying of husband-wife relationships. This fact is at present the cause of considerable burden because society is so suspicious of adult man-woman associations outside of marriage. The orthodox code now enforced by mass opinion offers no opportunity for the friendships that are not only natural but desirable even when men and women are married.

The trend at present among the wealthy and highly trained classes is toward greater recognition of the propriety and advantage of these associations that provide a wider expression of the need of comradeship than do husband-wife contacts. The ease, however, with which the erotic element intrudes, indeed the difficulty of keeping it outside any intimate fellowship of the mature male and female, leads often even in such classes to jealousies, suspicion, hostilities, and loss of affection. Only a radical reconstruction of the social code that regulates the conduct of men and women, which would take out the essence of the monogamic ideal, could remove such hazards. Nevertheless, the immediate trend is toward a lessening of the restrictions that have made extra-conjugal friendship so difficult between men and women. This is in part due to the greater

independence of women. The farther they move from the code which had its fullest expression when they were regarded as the property of the man, the more reasonable seems their freer association with other men than their husbands.

This may seem a prophecy of another attack on the significance of the family, the bringing of a competition which will lessen the value of domesticity, but this need not be true. Domesticity as realized by the comradeship of husband and wife may, through a more liberal code, gain in quality owing to the greater growth of personality what it loses in quantity, that is, in concentration.

Although the human need of comradeship is in part annexed by the family complex, when this is related to individual homes much variation has to be recognized. A family may enjoy a considerable stability and furnish genuine satisfactions even though there is a minimum of comradeship between the man and the woman. Families of this type divide into three classes that may be roughly designated as the boarding-house, brothel, and the commercial types. In the first, the man for the most part adds to his sex satisfactions the gaining of physical needs and comforts of the sort furnished by the boarding house; in the second, the interest is so exclusively sexual that although the intimacy be in quality different from that provided by the prostitute, the motivation leading to it is essentially the same. The third, and least common in present American culture, is the home that is established as a financial or professional asset. A derivation of this is a marriage that is sought because of its social prestige. This third type of motivation is perhaps more common than it seems because frequently there is no way of recognizing it as different from the genuinely love-impelled mating, but nevertheless it is contrary to the prevailing American code.

The importance of the comradeship-aspect of the familial amalgamation gives the companionate marriage its justification. There are those who for various reasons seek an intimacy exclusive in its meaning, but who are repelled from family experi-

ence. This frequently is the mood of the newly married, although much less often than is generally supposed since usually the young husband and wife look forward, after a brief interval, to the having of children. Anyone who is close to the reactions of married people finds it hard to persuade himself that this comradeship type of marriage will not continue to be preferred by many who enter matrimony. The fact that there is a multitude of marriages in which no children are contemplated and that there are likely to continue to be such marriages, at least for some time to come, makes it necessary that we have some way of distinguishing them from the more orthodox family-directed marriages, and it is greatly to be regretted that the expressive term "companionate" has been thrown into confusion by its use by Judge Lindsey to describe a very different type of union.

Since Dr. M. M. Knight, to whom we are indebted for the term, feels that it must be excluded from the vocabulary of the sociologists because its meaning is so likely to be misunderstood, and since social students are guilty of misusing the term in print,[9] the author of this book has used the term "the arrested family," to describe the same type of legal, intimate, companion-seeking relationship.[10] This emphasis upon the consequence of the association, its failure to carry human nature to the higher levels of familial experience, does not, as did Dr. Knight's term, give the motive of the union. Possibly by designating it the comradeship marriage, discussion can be freed from the emotional perversion that resulted from the agitations started by Judge Lindsey's book.

This special type of marriage provides the basis for a progressive relationship, even though this must take the form of greater meaning in the fellowship of husband and wife rather than the more maturing expansion made possible by the coming of children. It is a more difficult type of marriage to maintain

[9] M. M. Knight, "Companionate Marriage," *Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 4, pp. 113-115.

[10] E. R. Groves, *Social Problems of the Family*, chap. VI.

because ties of parenthood that normally strengthen the husband-wife relationship are excluded. In spite of this, it furnishes the means of growth of comradeship in the life together of a man and a woman, as the happiness and permanence of many marriages of sterile couples have long demonstrated, and it will remain with us as an important variant from orthodox marriage. It will be distinguished from a third variant, a relationship maintained by the man and woman who seek a similar comradeship intimacy but who are indifferent to or unable to assume a legalized commitment.

The parenthood element of the family complex

The parenthood aspect of the family provides the central core about which the domestic institution has developed. This part is therefore not only the most ancient but also the most firmly based of the four constitutents discussed. It must remain the essential trait of the complex, or human survival, if it is to persist, will have to be carried on by a new system of parent-child relationship foreign thus far to human experience; and even so there would be need of making some provision, as Plato recognized, for the activities now associated with mother care.

Since it seems characteristic of human thinking to turn, when it has matured, to first principles, progress in social science would seem to indicate that the family will be taken more seriously, its parenthood aspect more appreciated, as investigation gets closer to the basic motivations of the conduct of men and women. Legislation and practice will follow after thinking and investigation. Psychological science has already uncovered the hazards of parenthood. This is but the negative side of the fact that the parent-child relationship is socially primary in the growth of the individual and therefore in the composition of the social group.

The future development of this parenthood aspect of the family complex can only escape being influenced through the

eugenic program by a lessening inclination to accept the findings of science. It seems reasonable to assume that the opposite will prove true, that there will be a greater demand even in democratic states for a more thoroughgoing control of potential parenthood so as to carry out what has come to be designated as negative eugenics. This at most can only eliminate a small portion of undesirable births. Our knowledge of heredity is now too great to make the problems of mental deficiency and mental illness appear simple enough to be adequately handled by any program of sterilization, segregation, or birth control. Although the limitations of such efforts to prevent the transmission of undesirable stock will be recognized, public opinion is likely to become more determined that at least this much be done to better the welfare of society.

Whether there will be any response to more radical suggestions, such as attempts to direct transmission as in the later period of the Oneida Community, no one living at present is in the position to affirm or deny since it is impossible to anticipate the pressure that advancement in eugenics may bring. It would seem, however, that for some time to come it will be difficult to find a public opinion, especially where democracy prevails, that will permit for eugenic reasons any considerable control of human reproduction.

There is much more hope of society's insisting upon better preparation for parenthood. The insight that has been gathered by psychoanalysis, by psychological and sociological investigation, and by psychiatric experience gives force to the growing conviction that both the mother and the father need to have, not only for their own good and that of the child but for the welfare of society, an understanding of their responsibilities that can never come without specific preparation. At present, otherwise highly trained individuals can easily be found who as fathers and mothers are not only basically ignorant of their task, but mentally closed to any approach of science. The penalties of their unfitness for their responsibilities appear clearly but not, as a rule, until their children have gone so far

away from the formative period that little can be done to reconstruct their personalities.

It does not seem possible that society will continue to subject children to the most penetrating and causal influences of their career without demanding of those who manipulate such forces within the family a more adequate realization of their obligations than is common at present. The home cannot be left isolated as science goes forward in its understanding of human life. It seems fair to say that nowhere as yet is there such wastage of opportunity as is found in the home of parents who either neglect or are unprepared to meet the character-needs of their children. The progress that has been made already in advancing the physical care of the infant prophesies that parenthood itself in its larger aspect will be made more adequate. Our thinking at present is not prepared for any realization of how far this preparation may safely go when there is a rather general realization that the power of the untrained parent injures growing life.

The question naturally arises whether eventually society will not have to take some administrative responsibility for the assumption of parenthood, licensing those who may have children and forbidding as a serious crime those who are physically, morally, intellectually, or emotionally unequal to the responsibilities of parenthood, or unwilling to accept the task with seriousness. Such ideas are at present intolerable to our democratic attitudes; they seem fantastic and impractical, especially when one considers the difficulties of establishing such a scheme by legislation based on popular suffrage. It may, however, prove to be the logic of an increasing science of human conduct, and, if so, it may not be so far off as it now seems.

Any serious program of parenthood conservation will require supervision and the inspection of the home. No plan for the family will be likely to call forth such emotional protest as this. It remains true, however, that there is hardly a home, however well adjusted and in accord with the essential principles of the sciences of conduct, that would not profit if an objective ap-

praisal by a properly equipped specialist could be had. It is exceedingly difficult on account of the emotional characteristics of family life for the parent to become conscious of the undesirable influences associated with his authority and his association. Once they are convinced of this hazard inherent in parenthood, already impressive from recent scientific investigations, most fathers and mothers, since they do have at heart the welfare of the child, should welcome this objectivity, this visitation of judgment, as a co-operation rather than as an invasion of their parenthood prerogatives. So radical an innovation must come at first through parents joining together and voluntarily arranging for this service. It is but a step from the present practice of taking the child to the specialist or the clinic. Instead, however, of its being, as it now is, chiefly a curative effort, it will become what will make it much more socially profitable, a part of the preventive program that society is so rapidly constructing for the welfare of the child.

Offensive as these proposed interferences with private family life must be expected to seem to most of us now, they are suggested by the great quantity of criticism that has of late been directed by scientists, especially psychiatrists, against the practices of present-day parents. Opposition cannot effectively be made by arguing that parenthood is an instinct. The evidence is overwhelming that however much or little of instinct may lie at its basis, its expression reveals the influence of personal and social experience. It cannot be said that science is leading us toward some sort of institutionalized substitute for the family in the hope that this provides a panacea without the character-making sympathies and attachments normally associated with parenthood. The reverse is true. Science fully realizes the child's need of affection. It is merely insisting that this by itself no more prepares the parent to give his offspring a sound training for life than it does to furnish an adequate diet or to protect him from disease. Science certainly of late has shown no disposition to attempt to subtract parental emotions from the child's environment, but it is being forced to recognize the risk of such

feelings unless with them goes a saving objectivity and insight, an achievement difficult for the untrained and ill-advised mother or father.

There is one problem that is beginning to loom large and ominously, and that is an increasing disposition to limit parenthood artificially. The trend is so pronounced that it seems as if in the near future society must make a special effort to encourage the bearing of children. Indeed, motivated by the desire for cannon fodder, there are already various attempts being made by certain nations to increase their birth rate. There are two opposite aspects of this lessening of births that concern social welfare. One has to do with the optimum population that is desirable; the other, quite a different question, is the advantages that come from the experiences of domesticity and the hazards that develop in the childless family, and often in the one-child family. Although the latter type of family does not determine destiny, it does make more difficult the socializing of the child. A declining or even a stationary population is likely to bring the feeling that both problems need to be solved by some program that will increase the size of families.

The most common solution advocated is some form of subsidy. At present, governments tend toward an opposite policy and in their taxation programs generally discriminate against the family with children. The difficulty with any scheme of public subsidy is that until there is an heroic reversal of attitude toward the biological differences that exist between persons, it must in the light of orthodox science act as a dysgenic force. The subsidy cannot but be meager, which means that it will be relatively large for those on the lowest economic levels where at present the birth rate is proportionately high. In practice, since governments can create no wealth, it means taking chiefly from the middle class, where prudence in reference to the bearing of children has always been most observed, and giving to those to whom governmental aid will act as an economic incentive. Assuming that biologic fitness is not demonstrated by the mere willingness or ability to reproduce but by

qualitative characteristics belonging to the intellectually well-endowed, and that these are associated with a feeling of responsibility that tends toward restraint, nothing could be more dangerous for the race than stimulating births by public subsidy, since modern life is creating an increasing need of an intelligent population.

Even if it could be demonstrated that those who were producing the most children were biologically the most fit, in the sense that they are the most fertile—and there is nothing to indicate that this is true—it would still follow that good breeding must include more than this, that it must make provision for the transmission of as much superior intelligence as is possible. The suggestion of McDougall[11] that such a subsidy be in proportion to the earnings of the head of the family seems futile unless popular suffrage be abandoned and human destiny placed in the hands of dictators.

It is hard also to see how any progress can be made even in preferential mating on a voluntary basis, as Austin Freeman suggests,[12] unless first we have a social insistence on the keeping of individual family records. If those who married had to produce a brief transcript of the essential history of their relatives' life-careers for generations back, including causes of death, there would be some basis for biological discrimination in choice of mate.

Among modern youth there is already more willingness to consider eugenics as a part of their own marriage program than was true in generations past. They have, however, as a rule, little upon which to base their decision to marry or not to marry when the question arises regarding some specific mating. If their family records were available, and a society that keeps so accurately land titles would not find the machinery for such registration impossible, facts could be had that many young people would consider seriously.

[11] William McDougall, *Is America Safe for Democracy?* pp. 199-204.
[12] Austin Freeman, *Social Decay and Regeneration.*

Many changes of a sociological character can be reasonably expected that will offer greater opportunity for a wholesome functioning of the family. As an illustration of such changes, one that seems near at hand, we may choose what can roughly be described as a greater socialization of medicine. The present situation is becoming increasingly unsatisfactory both to the doctor and to the general public. It is a mixture of private practice, charity, and clinic services provided by social organizations, including hospitals, benevolence, and various enterprises that can be catalogued as public health services. Meanwhile the advance of medical science and the ever widening distribution of the knowledge of the value of preventive medicine are strengthening the demand by society for some sort of a medical program that will give adequate care and security to every family. From a social viewpoint it would be profitable to carry preventive medicine forward more aggressively since it would greatly lessen the more expensive illnesses and needless deaths.

The advance of the public health program increasingly emphasizes prevention and under present circumstances lessens the field in which the private physician functions. For example, it is interesting to have a general practitioner say that in his earlier career his chief support came from his typhoid cases, while at present he rarely has one case a year.

A greater pressure of public opinion for a more adequate program of preventive medicine appears one of the certainties of the very near future. The consequence of this for the medical profession must depend upon its statesmanship in meeting the problems associated with such an advance or its attempts to retard a movement that already is gathering force enough soon to prove irresistible. The general population is not antagonistic to the doctor, but most lay people do not appreciate the difficulty he faces in making the transition from a curative emphasis to a preventive basis in his profession. There is slight recognition of the necessity of maintaining the professional ethics and standards of the physician, which are greatly superior to those

of the government in matters that concern health and disease, but nevertheless the public in its demand for a more adequate medical policy is certain to take advantage of its power of legislation which permits it to control the physician's training and the conditions of his practice, unless the doctors themselves lead more rapidly than at present in a reform that is of the greatest importance to the family.

It is not merely the doctors that must change; society itself cannot accomplish what it seeks unless it goes much farther than its present practices to protect physical welfare. An example is the exploitation still permitted profit-seeking organizations that make use of the prevailing ignorance and superstition among a portion of the population to create a demand for useless, even harmful, drugs and nostrums. Since the physician feels that his ethics are far in advance of those of the government in practices that concern the health of the people, it is not strange that he resists attempts to bring his services under political control. Patent medicine is, however, merely an illustration of what needs to be stopped rather than of what society must be prepared to do if in any wholehearted manner it attempts to provide the average family with the resources of a preventive medical program. Medicine represents only one field in which we can expect radical changes in ideas of health protection that at least will offer the family greater opportunity for security and happiness.

There is great need, as is being more and more recognized,[13] of developing organizations for various types of research in the field of marriage and the family. There is an even greater need of organizations for a more effective distribution of such information as we now have. Much of this comes, and must come, from personal experiences in a form very difficult to render as statistical certainties. It is, however, no less valuable if it can be expressed in principles of conduct that can be applied to family living. Psychiatry, for example, through its necessity

[13] Ernest W. Burgess and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage*, pp. 371-373.

of helping individuals in trouble has gained considerable insight as to the common mishaps of family experience and the temptations that come to parents. These matters that concern the art of living need desperately to be carried into the feeling and thinking of those who as parents or teachers contribute so greatly the causal influences that in early life shape character.

The task of distributing this is already complicated by the fact that the scientist has been so reluctant to assume the responsibility that persons skilled in propaganda but usually deficient in background and balance have taken over for commercial purposes. There is as great a need of forcing these distributors of so-called help to parents to be trained, examined, and licensed as there is of demanding such professional standards of the physician or the dentist in their physical ministrations. The fact that this is not as yet recognized shows how slightly social thinking understands the tremendous power in the hands of those who distribute influences that act upon family life.

Much now points to the development of governmental control of such services for the family through the gradual extension in this country of organizations and activities now maintained by the nation or by the individual states. The development of these undertakings will offer such a temptation to regiment the family, presented in a form that will appeal to those eager to advance human welfare, that what should strengthen domesticity may easily become an attack on its unique privacy and independence. Protection through professional standards and ethics, similar to those of the physician, will be less likely to invite exploitation of the family for ulterior social, economic, or political purposes, and is therefore safer.

Future civilization and the family

The record of the twentieth century so far is making evident the fact that the social maturing of human nature does not keep pace with the ever increasing material resources of our developing civilization. Science, which has been mostly responsible for

the advances already made that permit our better understanding and manipulation of environment, has contributed much less effectively to that growth in emotional control and co-operation which civilization for its own security must demand of modern men and women. There are, however, no golden days of the past that reveal a social order the restoration of which will bring us safety. Civilization by its ongoing presents the question that has persisted throughout human evolution, but in a new and distinct form: Can general social intelligence make the progress necessary to safeguard our institutions and our values? The continual presence of such an issue demonstrates that although specific civilizations have come and gone, the social evolution of man proceeds.

Nothing of the past can guarantee the future, but the testimony of history thus far has been that specific nations and cultural systems may disappear but that always there have been men and women who were sufficiently adapting themselves to environmental demands to preserve the race. Culture, although man-made, becomes a selective process placing on those responsible for its formation requirements for successful adjustment and survival which in the past have been beyond the reach of groups of people who therefore have had to give way to others. Again, civilization is testing the adaptability of men and women who have created it, and in this ordeal the destiny of the family is at stake.

No civilization, no matter what may be its achievements along other lines, can escape judgment as to its social soundness, its capacity to satisfy human nature's basic needs for survival. Among these are the organizing and administering of interests that have been lodged in the home. Any failure to make intelligent use of both the material and immaterial resources that must from time to time be brought to a new adjustment in order to keep in safe balance social and material advances is quickly reflected in inadequate domestic standards and practices. Any failure to conserve the family reveals at once how dangerously civilization has lost its way.

A well-secured civilization, on the other hand, shows its strength through the quality of family life that it has brought forth and protects. The future of the family, therefore, will be determined by the future of the civilization in which it is embedded. At no time in human history were there more resources than at present for the building of wholesome family life or for making it the means of advancing human welfare. The proper functioning of the home, however, demands that parental intelligence improve since chiefly from the home must come the discipline and motivation necessary for a wise use of the resources provided by our rapid material progress. From no quarter will our political and social leadership get larger returns than from investment of thought and endeavor in matters that concern the family. The social functions that belong to the family give it the key position in the program of social adaptation which decides the survival of each civilization just as the physical and psychic adjustment determines the life-career of each individual.

Appendix

NOT ONLY is the literature concerned with marriage and the family immense and constantly increasing, but its quantity and the significance of new contributions make necessary its periodic reappraisal. Any printed list of references for the type of class that will use this book as a text must quickly become unsatisfactory to both instructor and student. It therefore seems best to the author to prepare yearly a considerable list of books on marriage and the family such as the advanced student may wish as background in his study in addition to the books to which reference is made in the various chapters. A mimeographed bibliography will be made by the time this book is published and once a year thereafter. It may be had for twenty-five cents by addressing the author.

Most instructors adopting this text will prefer few suggested assignments. The author has kept this in mind in preparing the following list and has attempted to choose subjects for report and topics for discussion that seem likely to encourage original contributions through reports, and independent thinking in class discussions. The latter are frequently controversial in character, but are designed to force the student to do more than express personal opinion. These questions should quickly reveal to the class members the difference between speaking with factual background and merely discharging personal emotions and prejudices, or repeating static thought. Many of the subjects for class reports invite the student to explore in greater detail some statement or illustration found in the text. The purpose of all class discussions should be to impress upon the student the significance of the family as an organization about which center the fundamental functions of socialization. The

placing on reserve of representative studies of primitive cultures, selected by the instructor as source material from which the students may draw data necessary for original reports, will prove a great advantage in the use of this text. A suggested list will be included in the bibliography, which will be revised each year.

I. *The Nature of the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Representative definitions of the family.
2. Economic systems of selected primitive groups.
3. The evolution of American family case work.
4. The psychiatric social worker's approach to family problems.
5. John Fiske on the infancy period.
6. Recent trends in the Chinese family.
7. Major social changes affecting contemporary American family life.
8. Review of W. P. Pycraft's *The Courtship of Animals.*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Can we trust the questionnaire method of gathering domestic data?
2. What are the special difficulties of research in the field of marriage and the family?
3. Is family counseling an art or a science?
4. Is the social significance of kinship increasing or decreasing?
5. Why did American youth not respond to Judge Lindsey's companionate marriage program?
6. What is the present conventionalized ideal of the family in your class and section?
7. Does this conventionalized ideal help or hinder marriage adjustment?

II. *Socialized Motives of the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Our present knowledge of the contributions of the endocrines to emotion.
2. The family as an organization for survival.

3. Food habits as they affect family life.
4. The building of the home around the hearth in primitive cultures.
5. Examples of the separation of sex and reproduction among animals.
6. Evidences of human nature's demand for the institution of marriage.
7. Vanity as a courtship, marriage, and parental motivation.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. How do the endocrines influence domestic motivation?
2. Is family morality the supreme socialization of human motives?
3. Does self-preservation take the first place in family conflict?
4. Why has man-made culture repressed the motivations of individual sex desire?
5. Is the separation of sex and reproduction in human culture a survival advantage?
6. What are the weaknesses of the taboo method of controlling sex behavior?
7. Should the child receive his religious training primarily in the home, the school, or the church?

III. *The Survival Functions of the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. The program for the orphan child in your state.
2. Ways by which the home creates in the child inferiority feelings.
3. The child's growth in feelings of family solidarity.
4. The love career of Amiel and its influence upon his thinking.
5. The Maori family system.
6. Examples of domestic magic in primitive society.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. What are the chief faults of the orphanage as an institution for the care of children?
2. How can persons suffering from frustration caused by family experience be helped toward normal attitudes?
3. Is the family as an organization inherently social?
4. Can an ape be brought up with a child without unfavorable discrimination in observing its development?

5. Is the average American family at present conservative or retarded?
6. Must the relationship of the sexes be an antagonistic co-operation?

IV. *The Incentive of Identity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Giddings's consciousness of kind and its domestic significance.
2. The normal modern birth cycle as a serial psychological development.
3. Illustrations of the *couvade* in primitive life.
4. A description of a kinship classification as found in some selected primitive group.
5. Le Play's stem-type of family.
6. The social significance in Japan of reverence for ancestors.
7. The Oneida Community marriage scheme.
8. The totemic system of some selected clan.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Why is solitary confinement so great a punishment?
2. Is it unwise to allow an unmarried mother who expects to give away her infant to see it and care for it?
3. Does poverty increase and wealth lessen the feeling of family identity?
4. Do you favor the common law attitude toward the testimony of spouses?
5. Do the principles of sex attraction and repulsion appear in the relationship of modern youth?
6. Is the prevailing common attitude toward the mother-in-law a product of social tradition or of factual experience?
7. Can one marry without marrying into the family of one's mate?
8. Do we have examples of fictitious identity in modern life?

V. *The Incentive of Perpetuity and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Attitudes toward death in some selected primitive culture.
2. Theories of the origin of religion.

3. Sterility as it affected the domestic codes of primitive people.
4. Case studies of parental fixation.
5. Historic illustrations of the attempts of famous men to control the career of their children.
6. An analysis of parent-child relationship in Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh.*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Is there a parental instinct?
2. Does Christianity rest upon belief in immortality?
3. Should sterility be a ground for modern divorce?
4. Can there be feelings of family identity without the existence of private property rights?
5. Is homesickness a proof of family fixation?
6. How can one break away from a family fixation?
7. What are the common motives that lead parents to project themselves through their children?
8. Does modern life encourage perversions of parental relationship?

VI. *The Incentive of Transcendency and the Lengthening of the Infancy Period*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. A review of Warwick Deeping's *Sorrell and Son.*
2. A review of Rudolf Besier's *The Barretts of Wimpole Street.*
3. Robert Briffault's theory of mother love in *The Mothers.*
4. Language as social experience.
5. The child's belief in magic as revealed by his play.
6. Case studies of Phyllis Blanchard illustrating diagnosis of the maladjustment of children through play.
7. Illustration of transcendency in Thornton Wilder's *Our Town.*
8. An interpretation of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's *Sonnets from the Portuguese.*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Is self-consciousness an individual or a social advantage, or both, or neither?
2. Can there exist an individualistic society?
3. Why cannot the family become a society by mere growth of numbers?

4. Is society supported by self-seeking or other-than-self attitudes, or by both?
5. In what sense can we say that the mother and child constitute the original self-conscious society?
6. Do you accept Siegfried Bernfeld's idea of play as spontaneously rehearsing birth?
7. Do you believe that the desire for motherhood can be fulfilled vicariously?

VII. *The Family Support of Culture*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Spencer's theory of society as an organism.
2. Thomas Hobbes on the origin of society.
3. The vocational responsibilities of the home in some selected primitive group.
4. Magic as related to the economic activities of primitive households.
5. Case studies of the *Polish Peasant* illustrating domestic disintegration due to the impact of a new culture.
6. Characteristic food taboos found among primitive peoples.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Does the child become social from within or from without, or both?
2. What inventions have in recent times produced changes in social ideas?
3. Do you believe that it is futile to try to retrace the prehistoric evolution of the family?
4. What likeness is there between the program of the Boy Scouts or the Camp Fire Girls and the activities of primitive youth?
5. What is the psychological process by which children take on food dislikes?
6. Is it socially safe to leave to the parents the power to interpret and distribute social culture?

VIII. *The Family Support of Formal Institutions*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Contemporary American domestic mores and folkways.
2. Representative sociological definitions of institutions.

3. Illustrations of spontaneous play of children expressing their own culture.
4. The pioneering work of G. Stanley Hall in developing child study.
5. Bird Baldwin's organization of the Iowa Child Welfare Station.
6. A review of Pierrepont Noyes's *My Father's House.*
7. Firth's description of child training among the New Zealand Maori.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Do you agree with Ward that every social institution has come in response to human need?
2. Have we any social vestiges in American contemporary family life?
3. Can children successfully resist the effort of adults to impose their culture?
4. Is the adult an alien to the child's world?
5. Did the Oneida Community fail on account of its radical marriage system or because of the growing opposition of its young people?
6. Can you give evidences of coercive attitudes toward children on the part of institutional leaders?

IX. *The Family Support of Government and Public Opinion*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Theories of the family origin of the state.
2. A description of blood ties in some selected primitive group.
3. Sumner's theory of the significance of the family in the development of government.
4. Examples of rural family feuds.
5. Illustrations of the significance of domestic roles in primitive society.
6. An analysis of sectional class differences in the domestic roles of contemporary American life.
7. A review of Margaret Mead's *Coming of Age in Samoa.*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Is the function of discipline within the family becoming relatively less important?
2. Should parents maintain or win authority over their children?

3. Do children respond to the prestige of adults?
4. Why are family legal quarrels so intense?
5. Does the modern family attempt to establish in the child an authority-accepting pattern of behavior?
6. Must an institution always tend toward the establishing of uniformity?
7. Do we have the principle of sanctions appearing in contemporary American family life?

X. *The Family Support of Education*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Examples and valuations of programs of modern parents who have taught their own children.
2. Review of Miller's *The Child in Primitive Society*.
3. Describe the contribution of the family to the education of children in some selected primitive group.
4. Family educational practices in Margaret Mead's *Growing Up in New Guinea.*
5. A review of Todd's *The Primitive Family as an Educational Agency*.
6. Food regulations as examples of child discipline in some selected primitive group.
7. Modern attempts to give schooling a home atmosphere.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Can a child be brought up without receiving educating influences?
2. Is a child best educated by routine or by self-conscious processes?
3. Is the modern school weakening or strengthening the family as an institution?
4. Do you favor the idea of allowing the child to learn by experience only?
5. Do modern children spontaneously express or acquire their belief in magic?
6. Should the nursery school and kindergarten take over from parents the responsibility for the intellectual training of young children?
7. Can parents be objective enough to give children sex instruction?

8. Are American social leaders exaggerating the importance of sex education?
9. Should every public school system have some mothers on the teaching staff?

XI. *The Family Support of Sex Status*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. A description of sex status in a selected primitive group.
2. Examples of secret societies among primitive people having sex status purpose.
3. A review of P. M. Kaberry's *Aboriginal Woman, Sacred and Profane.*
4. The influence of the Patrons of Husbandry on American sex status during the nineteenth century.
5. Pioneering influences that have affected sex status in America.
6. Division of labor in some selected primitive group.
7. Theories of necessary sex conflict in the relationship of men and women.
8. A review of Van de Velde's *Sex Hostility in Marriage.*
9. A review of Margaret Mead's *Sex and Temperament.*

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Are the distinctions between modern men and women chiefly products of biology or of social causation?
2. How do you explain the general social dominance of men throughout history?
3. Do differences in life-expectancy demonstrate that the female has the better organism?
4. Do we make too much social difference in America in the bringing up of the boy and the girl?
5. Is the dominance of the male in courtship socially justified?
6. Have we in contemporary American life evidences of dualistic attitudes toward woman and her social status?
7. Is the masculine code of sex conduct losing its authority?
8. What do you regard as the ideal program of sex status?

XII. *The Family Support of Religion*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. The chief theories of the origin of religion.
2. Religious system of some selected primitive group.

3. Representative definitions of magic.
4. A review of Lucien Lévy-Bruhl's *Primitive Mentality*.
5. A summary of William Graham Sumner's *Self Maintenance Interpretation of Religion.*
6. A summary of the religious evolution of Jewish faith, reaching its climax in monotheism.
7. A review of L. J. Sherrill's *Family and Church.*
8. A review of Edgar Schmiedeler's *An Introductory Study of the Family* for the Roman Catholic interpretation of the meaning of marriage.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Can an adult be normal without religious belief?
2. What are the natural religious expressions of the child before six years of age?
3. Should a young child have his own religion or be introduced to the adult's faith?
4. Do you believe that the closer a man is to nature, the greater his desire for security through religion?
5. Do the incentives for religion still come from the human desire for security?
6. What is the best family program for the religious training of the child?
7. What demands do modern American youth make upon the church?

XIII. *Family Interactions*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Representative definitions of interaction taken from sociological texts.
2. Studies of social suggestibility.
3. The influence and the significance of the stranger in specific primitive groups.
4. Illustrations of domestic communication without words.
5. An analysis of some specific moving picture that attempts to portray marriage or family life.
6. A review of W. W. Charters's *Motion Pictures and Youth.*
7. Illustrations of the ambivalent reactions of children within the home.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. How can a child be made by his family experience more susceptible to suggestion?
2. How do children become negative in their reactions to suggestion?
3. Which are the more significant—the conscious or the unconscious interactions of domestic life?
4. Why is primary contact so important?
5. Do moving pictures interpreting family situations influence the domestic attitude of children younger than twelve years?
6. Do the moving pictures on the whole help or hinder youth in their preparation for marriage?

XIV. *Emotional Characteristics of Family Experience*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Collect, interpret, and criticize representative definitions of emotions.
2. An analysis of the emotional characteristics of some person whom you know well.
3. An interpretation of the jealousy of Othello.
4. The technique of emotion analysis as required in marriage and family counseling.
5. The significance of domestic situations in specific cases of mental disorders.
6. Illustrations of the incongruous emotional reactions of children.
7. A review of some currently popular novel which attempts to portray the emotional aspects of domestic relationship.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Why are home relationships fundamentally emotional?
2. Is one better prepared for adjustment to life through dull or keen emotions?
3. Is it possible to understand the emotional characteristics of one's self?
4. What is excessive emotional reaction?
5. Should the family be an emotional refuge?
6. What do children owe parents?
7. What should be the ideal of the parent as he attempts the emotional training of his child?

XV. *The Family and the Aggressive Mechanisms*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. Plato's plan for escaping the dangers of the mother-child relationship.
2. The substitution for the mother-child relationship in the Oneida Community.
3. An analysis of the husband-wife relationship disclosed by Havelock Ellis in his autobiography.
4. The child's technique for the gaining of attention from the first through the third year.
5. Freud's interpretation of the jealousy of children.
6. An analysis of a case study of family jealousy.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. What are the chief hazards of infancy dependency?
2. Is the freedom of emotions in the family an asset or a liability of the home?
3. How much privacy should a child have in the home? A husband? A wife?
4. What substitutions for domestic emotional security are open to the unmarried?
5. Can intimacy exist without affection?
6. Is jealousy inevitable in the child's early career?
7. How can the parent prepare a young child for the coming of a brother or a sister so as to lessen the risks of jealousy?
8. Is jealousy a social defense of monogamy?

XVI. *The Family and the Defensive Mechanisms*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. An analysis of a life-career revealing chronic habits of emotional retreat.
2. A report of Flügel's *A Psychoanalytic Study of the Family*.
3. Illustrations of compartment programs within domestic relationship.
4. Cases of parental fixation that have influenced mating.
5. Illustrations of a dominant fear of life as a result of parental influence.
6. Cases of marriage failure due to excessive dependency on parents.
7. Cases of inferiority feeling that have led to marriage failure.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. What evidence could one find in early childhood of the beginning of chronic emotional retreat?
2. Can the extravert develop chronic habits of retreat?
3. Do you believe that affection in itself is neither good nor ill?
4. Is it true that strong parents have weak children?
5. How do parents protect themselves from discovering their desire to keep their children from escaping dependency?
6. How can the parent lessen the psychic risks of the child's experiences of illness?
7. Do you believe that the average American parent gives too little or too much attention to the emotions of the child?

XVII. *The Clash of Loyalties within the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. A review of Jacob Royce's *The Philosophy of Loyalty*.
2. Descriptions of children's loyalty.
3. Case studies showing conflict in children due to the divorce of parents.
4. The childhood career of the Earl of Shaftesbury and its influence on his adult passion for social reform.
5. Descriptions of ancestor worship in selected cultures.
6. An interpretation and criticism of the doctrine of childhood ambivalence.
7. Case studies illustrating clashing of loyalties in the experiences of immigrant children.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Can a sane person be devoid of loyalties?
2. What was the loyalty of Socrates? Of Darwin? Of Lincoln? Of Napoleon Bonaparte?
3. Can divorced parents prevent the young child from experiencing conflict of loyalties?
4. Do you believe that there must be ambivalence in domestic relations?
5. Must college education bring a clashing between new and old loyalties?
6. Is it normal for a young child to feel that he is a partisan of his mother against his father, or the reverse?

7. Can the adolescent clashing of loyalties be prevented by the family program?
8. Must early marriage bring clashing of loyalties as a prelude to better adjustment?

XVIII. *The Environmental Sensitiveness of the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

1. A description of environmental adaptation in the domestic culture of some selected primitive group.
2. A description of environmental adaptation in the domestic culture of some selected modern group.
3. The radio as it influences American family life.
4. A review of Chapter III, Volume I, *Recent Social Trends in the United States.*
5. Urbanization as it affects family life in the United States.
6. A review of Chapter I of George Crile's *Diseases Peculiar to Civilized Man.*
7. Present trends in the rural and urban death rate of your state.
8. The present program of housing reform in the United States.
9. Changes in Negro family life as a result of migration from the rural South to northern cities.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Is a modern American family more or less sensitive to its environment than the American colonial family was?
2. Does the prevailing physical or social environment have the greater influence on present American family life?
3. Has the automobile on the whole been an advantage or a disadvantage to American family life?
4. Would the family become a docile institution in a static environment?
5. Does the present American family attempt to achieve greater independence of social environment?
6. Would it be an advantage to the American family if changes due to inventions could be slowed up?
7. How does the increase of hypertension affect American domestic life?
8. Is the more desirable American family life to be found in the urban or in the rural environment?

XIX and XX. *The Evolution of Social Thought Concerning the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

It is suggested that the instructor assign the works of as many of the authors mentioned in the text as he wishes to emphasize through individual reports, and also the contributions of other writers whose domestic thinking he wishes to bring to the attention of the class.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Which of the writers mentioned comes nearest to your own thinking concerning the family?
2. What has been the chief contribution of Christian thinking concerning the family?
3. Do you agree with Swedenborg in his distinction between natural and spiritual love?
4. Do you accept Plato's idea that each person seeks to complete himself through union with one of the opposite sex?
5. Are there two fundamental types of women, as Weininger stated?
6. Do you agree with Comte that women are naturally more sympathetic and affectionate than men?
7. Was Giddings right in asserting that on the lowest levels of culture the most common marriage was that of a temporary monogamy?
8. Does Cooley's "looking-glass self" chiefly originate from family experience?
9. What do you think of Ellen Keys's statement that the ideal of marriage should be the perfectly free union of a man and a woman?
10. Do you believe it would be an advantage to American women to have the equal rights amendment to the Constitution enacted?
11. What effects is the popularizing of birth control having on American family life?
12. What has Freud's doctrine of psychoanalysis contributed to our understanding of family life?
13. Has Ellis or Dickinson given us the greater insight into the problems of modern sex adjustment?
14. What are the chief obstacles in developing education for family life?

XXI. *The Future of the Family*

SUBJECTS FOR REPORTS:

Review the following:

1. J. K. Folsom's *The Family*, Chapter 18, "The Future of the Family System."
2. Willystine Goodsell's *Problems of the Family*, Chapter 24, "The Family in the Future."
3. Count Herman Keyserling's *The Book of Marriage*, pp. 216-243, "Marriage in the New World."
4. M. F. Nimkoff's *The Family*, Chapter 12, "Family Reorganization."
5. H. W. Odum's *American Social Problems*, Chapter 23, "The Home and the Family."
6. Ernest R. Mowrer's *Family Disorganization*, Chapter 13, "New Horizons for the Family."
7. Una P. Sait's *New Horizons for the Family*, Chapter 25, "New Horizons for the Family."
8. Willard Waller's *The Family*, Chapter 22, "The Family and Morality."
9. Ray E. Baber's *Marriage and the Family*, Chapter 18, "The Conservation of Family Values."

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Why has there been so much skepticism regarding the family in recent social thinking?
2. Are American young people losing confidence in marriage?
3. Does the family as an institution receive more criticism than other institutions?
4. Is the significance of sex as an aspect of marriage increasing or decreasing in the United States?
5. Is American medicine changing its attitude toward sex?
6. Is sublimation of sex in some degree an inevitable demand of human culture?
7. What should be the American divorce program?
8. What economic influences are now operating on the American home, and what are their consequences?
9. Is the working outside the home of the married woman fundamentally detrimental to the family?
10. Must monogamy be socially monotonous?

11. Do you expect parenthood to be more or less controlled by social custom and legislation in the future?
12. Are you in sympathy with Austin Freeman's idea of preferential mating?
13. What changes in public policy are needed to conserve family welfare?
14. What changes in educational policy are needed to conserve marriage?

Index of Names

Abram, 120
Alexander, Franz, 455 n., 456 n.
Allee, W. C., 57 n., 63 n., 261 n.
Allen, James Lane, 424
Allport, G. W., 307, 307 n., 308 n.
Alverdes, Friedrich, 63 n.
Amiel, Henri-Frederic, 78, 78 n.
Andrews, B. R., 8 n., 551
Anthony, Susan B., 532 n., 533
Aristotle, 9, 499-500, 499 n.
Aurelius, Marcus, 500-501, 500 n.

Bachofen, Johann J., 515-516, 516 n.
Baitsell, G. A., 258 n.
Bartlett, Harriet M., 10 n., 11 n.
Basden, G. T., 117 n., 222 n., 235 n., 280 n.
Beam, Lura, 550
Bebel, August, 539, 539 n.
Benedict, Ruth, 285 n.
Berkow, S. G., 469 n.
Bernard, L. L., 22 n., 251 n., 321 n.
Bernfeld, Siegfried, 145 n., 153 n.
Berridge, W. A., 528 n.
Berry, Katherine, 467 n.
Blagden, C. O., 228 n.
Blanchard, Phyllis, 325 n., 390 n.
Blumenthal, Albert, 164 n.
Blumer, Herbert, 298, 298 n., 300 n.
Bongiorno, Andrew, 525 n.
Bradlaugh, Charles, 542
Bridgman, Ralph P., 14 n.
Briffault, Robert, 45 n., 98 n., 99 n., 105 n., 108 n., 111 n., 255 n., 517 n., 517-518
Brill, A. A., 98 n.
Brim, Charles J., 47 n., 260 n.
Britten, F. H., 438 n.
Bromley, L. B., 438 n.
Brooks, Evelyn C., 160, 160 n.
Brooks, L. M., 160, 160 n.
Brumbaugh, Martin G., 503 n.
Bryant, Louise Stevens, 550
Burgess, E. W., 291 n.
Burrow, Trigant, 35 n., 50 n.
Butterfield, Oliver M., 438 n.

Cabot, Richard, 10 n.
Cadbury, W. W., 455 n.
Calvin, John, 475
Campbell, Dugald, 89 n., 168 n.
Cannon, Walter B., 388 n.
Carlisle, Richard, 541
Carpenter, Edward, 537-538, 537 n.
Carpenter, Niles, 467 n.
Charters, W. W., 297 n.
Child, Charles M., 196 n.
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 500, 500 n.
Claridge, G. Cyril, 167 n.
Cobbett, William, 457, 458 n.
Comte, Auguste, 9, 520-521, 520 n., 527
Confucius, 495-496, 495 n.
Conklin, Edwin G., 258 n.
Cooke, G. W., 60 n., 128 n.
Cooley, Charles H., 526, 526 n.
Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr., 591 n.
Crawley, Ernest, 86 n., 87 n., 105 n., 106 n., 228, 228 n., 229 n., 279 n., 385 n.
Crile, George, 10 n., 68 n., 326 n., 465 n., 469 n.
Curb, D. L., 455 n.

Darwin, Charles, 13-14, 63, 63 n., 407, 468, 508-509, 509 n., 511, 528
Darwin, F., 14 n.
Davenport, C. B., 464 n.
Davis, Kingsley, 85 n., 86 n., 88 n.
Deegener, P., 63 n.
Dell, Floyd, 430 n.
Dickens, Charles, 157

Dickinson, Robert L., 543, 550
Dix, Dorothea, 59
Dollard, John, 398 n.
Donison, C. P., 455 n.
Dorsey, J. O., 102 n.
Drummond, Henry, 147-148, 147 n., 148 n., 149, 149 n., 511-514, 511 n.
Drysdale, Dr. George, 542
Dunlap, Knight, 43 n.
Durkheim, Émile, 60, 60 n.

Ellis, Havelock, 45 n., 109, 109 n., 547-548
Ellis, Mrs. Havelock, 536 n., 537
Enders, E. L., 489 n.
Engel, Christian Lorenz Ernst, 528, 528 n.
Engels, Frederic, 528-529
Evans, I. H. N., 37 n., 100 n.
Evans, W., 25 n.
Evans, Wayne Y., 538 n.
Evans-Pritchard, E. E., 100 n.
Eustochium, 485

Fahr, G., 455 n.
Farnsworth, Paul R., 164 n.
Finney, R. T., 259 n.
Firth, Raymond, 7 n., 36 n., 37 n., 79 n., 80 n., 89 n., 167 n., 169 n., 192 n., 228 n.
Fiske, John, 19 n., 513 n.
Flinn, R. A., 528 n.
Flugel, J. C., 391 n., 420 n.
Folsom, J. K., 25 n., 321 n., 444 n., 472 n., 539, 539 n.
Fosdick, H. E., 25 n.
Foster, Sybil, 330 n., 375, 375 n.
Frampton, M. E., 90 n., 421 n.
Frank, Lawrence K., 338 n.
Frazer, J. G., 97 n., 171 n., 280 n., 281 n.
Frazier, E. Franklin, 446 n.
Freeman, R. Austin, 301 n., 589, 589 n.
Freud, Sigmund, 98 n., 370 n., 431, 431 n., 432 n., 545-546, 545 n., 574, 574 n.
Fuller, Margaret, 533
See also Ossoli, Margaret Fuller

Gage, Matilde Joslyn, 532 n.
Gandhi, Mahatma, 408
Geddes, Patrick, 528
Gesell, Arnold, 39 n.
Giddings, Franklin Henry, 57 n., 85, 215, 292, 292 n., 524-525, 524 n.
Gillen, F. J., 228 n., 314 n.
Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, 534, 534 n.
Gladstone, William E., 416
Godwin, William, 541
Goldenweiser, Alexander A., 98 n., 279 n.
Goodsell, Willystine, 484 n., 552, 553 n.
Gorer, Jeoffrey, 103 n.
Groos, Karl, 81 n.
Grosse, Ernst, 19
Groves, Ernest R., 25 n., 79 n., 104 n., 254 n., 265 n., 338 n., 533 n., 551-552, 583 n.

Hagar, 120
Haldane, R. B., 506 n.
Hale, Edward Everett, 292
Hall, G. Stanley, 187, 546-547
Hambley, W. D., 176 n.
Hammond, Barbara, 59 n., 79 n., 572, 572 n.
Hammond, J. L., 59 n., 79 n., 572, 572 n.
Hankins, F. H., 469 n.
Harrington, Milton, 327 n., 346 n.
Hart, Ella B., 438 n.
Hart, Hornell, 438 n.
Hawkridge, Emma, 282 n.
Healy, William, 305 n., 306, 306 n., 309 n.
Hertzler, Joyce O., 181 n., 251 n., 273 n.
Himes, Norman E., 540 n., 541 n., 542 n.
Hinton, James, 536-537, 548
Hirschfeld, Magnus, 548
Hobbes, Thomas, 57, 144 n., 163, 163 n.
Hobhouse, L. T., 76, 76 n., 189 n.
Höffding, H., 60 n.
Hoover, President Herbert, 449
Hopkins, E. Washburn, 60 n., 279 n.
Hopkins, F. W., 127 n.
Hose, Charles, 176 n.
Hoskins, R. G., 33 n., 68 n., 563 n., 564 n.

Howard, G. E., 19 n., 126 n.
Howitt, A. W., 106 n., 170, 170 n., 229 n.
Huxley, Thomas, 511

Ishimoto, Baroness Shidzué, 102, 102 n., 416, 416 n., 417, 417 n., 418
Ismail, Abd-El-Aziz, 455 n.

Jacob, 120
Jacobs, H. E., 489 n.
Jarcho, Julius, 259 n.
Jennings, H. S., 3 n.
Jerome, 485
Jesus, 480-481, 486
Jewett, Sarah Orne, 354 n.
Jocher, Katharine, 13 n.
Johnson, Buford J., 192 n.
Johnson, Henrietta, 238
Johnson, Samuel, 461
Jowett, Benjamin, 496 n., 499 n.
Jung, C. G., 61 n., 118 n., 314 n., 319 n.

Kaberry, Phyllis M., 259 n.
Kanner, Leo, 153 n., 174 n., 192 n., 284 n., 324 n., 427 n.
Kant, Immanuel, 503, 503 n.
Karpf, Maurice, 12 n.
Keller, A. G., 47 n., 49 n., 58 n., 65 n., 77 n., 78 n., 200 n., 201 n., 210 n., 211 n., 212 n., 216 n., 217 n., 523 n.
Kellogg, L. A., 75 n.
Kellogg, W. N., 75 n.
Kemp, J., 506 n.
Kennedy, Albert J., 91 n.
Key, Ellen, 534-535, 534 n.
Klaatsch, Herman, 38 n.
Knight, Melvin M., 25, 25 n., 539, 539 n., 565, 583, 583 n.
Knowlton, Charles, 542
Kostlin, Julius, 487 n.
Kroeber, A. L., 88 n.
Kropotkin, P., 57, 57 n., 63, 148-149, 148 n., 149 n.
Kulp, D. H. II, 18 n.

Lancaster, Joseph, 227, 238
LaPiere, Richard T., 164 n.
Lenski, G. E., 487 n., 488 n.
Leonard, Arthur G., 59-60, 60 n., 80, 80 n., 81 n., 120 n., 274, 274 n.
Le Play, Frédéric, 6, 90, 527, 527 n.
Lesser, Alexander, 88 n.
Levine, Maurice, 155 n.
Levy, David M., 330 n.
Lévy-Bruhl, Lucien, 93 n., 120 n., 169 n., 279 n., 285 n.
Lindeman, E. C., 29 n.
Lindsey, Ben B., 25 n., 538-539, 538 n., 565, 583
Lippert, Julius, 38 n.
Livingston, Arthur, 525 n.
Livingstone, Robert, 111 n.
Love, A. G., 464 n.
Lowie, R. H., 74, 74 n., 88 n., 199, 199 n., 200, 201, 201 n., 204 n., 208, 208 n., 211
Luther, Martin, 486-489
Lynd, Helen M., 135, 135 n.
Lynd, R. S., 135, 135 n.

Maine, Sir Henry, 514, 514 n., 515
Malinowski, Bronislaw, 41 n., 47, 47 n., 75 n., 87-88, 88 n., 93, 93 n., 94 n., 120, 120 n., 226, 226 n., 228 n., 232 n., 233, 233 n., 281 n., 518-519, 540-541, 570, 570 n.
Marshall, Helen E., 59 n.
Martin, Everett Dean, 60 n.
Martineau, Harriet, 520 n.
Marx, Karl, 528-529
Matthews, J. L., 455 n.
Matthiessen, Francis Otto, 354 n.
Maugham, Somerset, 445, 445 n.
May, Geoffrey, 44 n.
McDougall, William, 361-362, 589, 589 n.
McGee, W. J., 63 n.
McGiffert, Arthur C., 487 n.
McKenzie, R. D., 457 n., 472 n.
McLennan, John F., 514-515, 515 n.
McNeil, Edwin E., 333 n.
Mead, George H., 72 n., 73 n., 81 n., 84 n., 527, 527 n.
Mead, Margaret, 46 n., 172 n., 200, 200 n., 205 n., 206, 207 n., 225 n., 227 n., 232 n., 235 n., 262 n., 347 n., 519
Meaker, S. R., 468 n.
Melland, F. H., 100 n., 253 n.
Mencius, 496, 496 n.
Meyer, Johann J., 547 n.

Mill, James, 541
Mill, John Stuart, 530-531, 531 n.
Miller, Nathan, 222 n., 223 n., 230 n., 234 n.
Monroe, Day, 5 n., 473 n.
Monroe, Paul, 19
Morgan, Lewis H., 515
Murdock, George Peter, 38 n.
Myerson, Abraham, 42 n., 57 n., 385 n.

Napoleon, 43, 126-127
Nelson, H., 60 n.
Nogi, General Count Maresuki, 417
Notestein, Frank W., 467 n.
Noyes, Arthur P., 32 n., 347 n., 402 n.
Noyes, John Humphrey, 95, 355, 412, 542
Noyes, Pierrepont, 95-96, 95 n., 96 n., 189 n., 355 n., 433, 433 n.

Odum, Howard W., 13 n., 452 n.
Ogburn, W. F., 79 n., 452, 452 n.
Ossoli, Margaret Fuller, 533 n. *See also* Fuller, Margaret
Owen, Robert, 53, 238, 539 n., 542
Owen, Robert Dale, 539, 539 n., 542

Pareto, Vilfredo, 525-526, 525 n.
Park, R. W., 291 n.
Parker, Robert Allerton, 188 n.
Parkman, Francis, 532, 533 n.
Patten, William, 57 n., 139 n., 149
Paul, Cedar, 431 n., 432 n.
Paul, Eden, 431 n., 432 n.
Paula, 485
Payne, William H., 501 n., 502 n.
Pepys, 341
Pestalozzi, 238
Philip of Hesse, 488
Piaget, Jean, 239-240
Pitt, Frances, 146 n.
Place, Francis, 541, 543
Plant, James S., 135 n.
Plato, 9, 350, 496-499, 496 n., 500, 579, 584
Pope Leo XIII, 494
Pope Pius XI, 544
Pope Pius XII, 493
Powell, J. W., 255 n.

Quételet, 528

Rachel, 120
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., 200 n.
Rank, Otto, 241 n.
Ratzel, F., 130 n.
Reid, Margaret G., 6-7, 6 n., 7 n.
Reynert, M. L., 321 n., 325 n.
Richards, Esther Loring, 154 n.
Riggs, A. F., 10 n.
Robie, W. F., 548-550
Robinson, Virginia P., 12 n.
Rockwood, Lemo Dennis, 550 n.
Rosanoff, A. J., 327 n., 464 n.
Roscoe, John, 47 n., 102 n., 214 n., 222, 222 n., 223 n., 226 n.
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 241, 501-502, 501 n.
Royce, Jacob, 407, 407 n., 408, 409 n., 410 n.
Russell, Bertrand, 538, 566

Sadler, William S., 32 n., 332 n.
Saint Augustine, 485-486, 568
Saint Paul, 481-483
Sanger, Margaret, 542-543
Sarah, 120
Saul, Leon J., 455 n.
Sayles, Mary B., 371 n., 372 n.
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 506-508, 506 n.
Schulze, V. E., 455 n.
Schwab, E. H., 455 n.
Sewell, M., 374, 374 n.
Shaftesbury, the Seventh Earl of, 58-59, 303
Shakespeare, 330
Silas, Ellis, 382 n.
Skeat, W. W., 228 n.
Smith, W. R., 103 n.
Sneath, E. Hershey, 57 n.
Socrates, 407
Sokoloff, Boris, 43 n.
Spencer, B., 228 n., 314 n.
Spencer, Mrs. Anna Garlin, 551, 552
Spencer, Herbert, 35, 468, 509-511, 509 n., 510 n., 514
Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, 532 n., 533
Starcke, 516 n.
Stekel, Wilhelm, 45, 45 n.
Stone, Lucy, 535-536
Stopes, Marie, 542-543
Strong, William D., 108 n.

Sumner, William Graham, 8, 8 n., 46, 47 n., 49 n., 58 n., 65 n., 77 n., 78, 78 n., 110 n., 111 n., 178, 191, 191 n., 200, 200 n., 201 n., 210 n., 211 n., 212-213, 212 n., 216, 216 n., 217 n., 523-524, 523 n.
Swedenborg, Emanuel, 489-492

Terman, L. M., 338 n., 484 n.
Tertullian, 483-484
Theis, Sophie van Senden, 160 n.
Thomas, W. I., 86 n., 100 n., 102 n., 103 n., 104 n., 116 n., 169 n., 206 n., 385, 385 n., 422 n.
Thompson, Helen, 39 n.
Thompson, W. S., 467 n., 471 n.
Thoreau, 462
Thorndike, E. L., 463 n.
Todd, A. J., 227 n.
Tolstoy, 431, 568
Tozzer, A. M., 201 n.
Trotter, W., 56, 56 n., 150 n., 412 n.
Trumbull, J. H., 126 n.

Unterman, E., 528 n.
Unwin, J. D., 519, 519 n., 567, 567 n.

Van de Velde, T. H., 78 n., 106 n., 254 n.
Vatsya Yana, 547
Vendryes, J., 151 n.
Vernier, Chester G., 96 n., 553, 553 n.
von Bora, Katharina, 487

Wall, O. A., 282 n.
Wallas, Graham, 541
Wallis, Wilson D., 91 n., 92 n., 275 n.
Ward, Lester F., 46, 46 n., 181, 181 n., 255, 255 n., 521-522, 521 n.
Warner, W. Lloyd, 85 n., 86 n., 88 n.
Watson, J. B., 433 n.
Webster, Hutton, 254 n.
Weininger, Otto, 503-506, 503 n.
Weiss, Edward, 455 n.
Westermarck, Edward A., 98 n., 101, 101 n., 415 n., 516-517, 516 n., 518
Wheeler, W. M., 63 n., 196 n.
Whelpton, P. K., 467 n.
Whitehead, Alfred N., 60 n., 289, 289 n.
Whittier, 354 n.
Wieman, Regina, 60 n.
Wile, Ira S., 403 n.
Williamson, Robert W., 228 n., 235 n.
Windsor, Edward, 547 n.
Winslow, E. A., 528 n.
Wissler, Clark, 94 n., 97 n.
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 530
Woods, Robert A., 91 n.
Woodsmall, Ruth F., 8 n.

Zimmerman, C. C., 6 n., 90 n., 421, 421 n.
Znaniecki, F., 169 n., 206 n., 422 n.

General Index

Adaptation
 conscious and unconscious, 162-163
 to masculine-feminine status, 271-272
Adjustment
 double meaning of, 451
 of family, a two-way process, 448-450
 the fundamental life-principle, 162-163
Adolescence
 clashing of loyalties in, 428-432
 importance of family policy regarding, 347-348
 and religion, 285-286
 source of family variation, 188-189
Adoption
 feeling of social case work in regard to, 87
 identity, 102-103
 need of identity in, 87
Affection
 exploitation of, 389-390
 positive and negative aspects of, 355-356
Aged, the, 316-317
Aggressive mechanisms
 dominance, 383-385
 jealousy, 362-383
Ambivalency, 418-420
Ancestor worship
 in China and Japan, 101-102
 in the development of religion, 278-279
 identity in, 93, 101
Ancestral loyalty, 414-418
Andamanese
 food taboos among the, 228-229
 government among the, 199
Antagonism between the sexes, 267-268
Anthropologists, the, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 514-519
Apartments, 472-473
Arrested family, meaning of, 25-26, 583
Asceticism, 483-485
Association, family
 and inward response, 309-310
 and outward response, 311-313
Attitude
 domestic significance of, 329-331
 of family toward suicide, 333-334
 of men toward women, 266-267
 the morbid, 331-334
Attitudes
 childhood, 336-339
 contribution of home toward growth of, 336-339
 unsocial, rooted in childhood, 190-191
Australian Kariera, 86
Australians, complex marriage relationship of the, 23
Authority, maintenance of, 204-206
Autoeroticism, 549

Baganda
 adoption among the, 226
 education among the, 226
Beena marriage, 515
Birth Control Movement
 and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 540-545
 opposition to the, 543-545
Birth process
 among primitive people, 258-259
 meaning of, 85-86

Birth rate, 588-589
in Italy, Germany, England, Wales, Japan, 468
Blood brotherhood, 99-101
Boy Scouts, 168
Budget, family, as used by Le Play, 6

Campfire Girls, 168
Case study, 11-12
Catholic, Roman, 493-495
Change, family's sensitivity to, 450-462
Child
ambivalent attitude toward parents, 306
culture of the, 184-186
and development of comradeship needs, 580-581
effect of hypochondriacal attitudes on, 174
emotional exploitation of, 342-346
emotional hazards of illness, 395-397
entrance into institutions, 193
an example of extension of adjustment processes, 164
family exploitation of the, 55-56
feeling of love intermittent, 371-372
growth of loyalty in, 425-426
helpless to avoid influences, 183-184
incongruous reactions of the 334-336
influence of moving pictures on, 298
initiation of the, 175-176
integration of personality, 307
loyalties of the, 408-409
neglect of, in science of sociology, 16
nurture, 260
overprotection of the, 393-394
reaction to aggressiveness or weakness, 391-392
reality of the, 239-241
reared with a chimpanzee, 75
recoil from formal school program, 168
and religious stimuli, 283-285
and sex status, 263-265
tendency to imitate, 173-174
training of the Maori, 167
training and social survival, 81-82
the unwanted, 372
Childhood
attitudes, 336-339
clashing of loyalties in, 424-428
and inferiority feeling, 402
Childless family, meaning of, 25-26
Children, spacing of, 365-367
Chimpanzee, Gua, 75
Chinese family, 18, 19
impact of Western civilization upon, 208-209
type of religion, 128
Church
and the family, 286-289
"programs" of the, 287
vitality of the, 287-288
Church Fathers, the, 483-485
City
detrimental influences of the, 459-460
ecological drift away from, 472-473
subject to a double tension, 464
Civilization
of the future, 592-594
penalties to the emotions, 326
proceeds in constant lapses, 164
and reproduction, 467-470
Civil War, effect on status of woman, 533-534
Community and home co-existent, 80
Companionate marriage, 25, 539, 565, 583
Compensation, 401
Comradeship marriage, 583
Conference on Family Life, 492-493
Consciousness of kind, 85, 215, 292
Contact, 293-304
and courtship interactions, 300-301
cursory, 293-294, 296-300
family, 302-304
prerequisite to interaction, 293-295
primary and secondary, 293
significance of, 294-295
types of, 293-294
Contraception, 159, 467-469
Convalescence, hazards of, 397
Co-operation
and the doctrine of evolution, 63
economic, 77-79
promotes socialization of the individual, 52-53
in sex and reproduction, 51-52

Co-operation—*continued*
structural and functional aspects of, 137-138
Counseling, family
art of, 13-15, 331
rapid growth in desire for, 14
Courtship
and clashing of loyalties, 435-438
interaction, 300-302
jealousy in, 375-377
and moving pictures, 296
Couvade, 86, 260
Culture
of the child, 184-186
and the composition of the home, 315-316
continuity of child's, 184
as increased resources, 165-166
of man advanced on three fronts, 142
material and immaterial, 166, 169-172
perpetuation of, 76
primitive contrasted with modern, 177
role of, in interaction, 312-313
spread of, 457-458
weakness of child's, 185-186
Curricula, goals of the, 242

Death, reaction to, 115-117
Defensive mechanisms
dependency, 395-400
inferiority feeling, 400-406
retreat, 386-394
Delinquency, 340
Dementia praecox, 564
Dependency
as a defensive mechanism, 395-400
and fear, 395
and marriage, 399-400
Disease, relation to emotion, 10
Divorce
attitude of the church toward, 481
effect on loyalties of child, 427-428
and the right to marry, 569-570
social policies regarding, 568-570
Domestic
dominance, 383-385
emotion, 329-331
environment, 339-342
Domestic—*continued*
ideal, 319-320
interaction, 317-319
lag, 304-305
perpetuity, 133-134
relations, and cursory contact, 296-300
roles, 206
security, 317-319
Dominance
domestic, 383-385
masculine, 255
Drives, psychic, 34-41

Economic
co-operation, 77-79
element of the family complex, 570-584
security, demand for, 575-576
unit, the family an, 5-8
Economists, the, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 527-529
Education
and clashing of loyalties, 423-424
for family life, 241-245
goals of the curricula, 242
hazards of formal, 239
for marriage and the family, 550-553
primitive
curriculum, 226-227
moral and spiritual guidance, 232-235
not formal, 220-221
principle of, 223
through nurture, 224-225
sex; *see* Sex education
a social necessity, 220-221
Ego survival, 69-73
Emotional
age, 325-326
change within the family, 348-349
exploitation, 342-346
maladjustment and the family, 358-362
maturity, 155-157
refuge, the family as an, 354-355, 454
retreat, 386-390
transference, 360

Emotions
and biological survival, 68
and change of attitudes, 340
and disease, relation of, 10
family as an incubator for, 353-356
hate and love, 419
importance of formative period in development of, 325-326
as life-responses, 323-326
meaning of, 321
as social adjustments, 326-329
subjective characteristics of, 334, 361
Employment, out-of-home, 7
Encyclical Letter
of Pope Pius XI, 544
of Pope Pius XII, 493-495
Endocrine responses, 326
England, birth rate in, 468
Environment
and the family, 441-444, 473-474
physical, 443-446
psychic, 453-456
Eskimo, 94, 230
Eugenics
in the marriage program, 589
negative, 585
Euthenics, 552
Evolutionists, and evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 508-514
Ewes, African village of the, 91
Extravert, 268

Family
adaptation to masculine-feminine status, 271-272
affected by proportion of aged in population, 316-317
affected by urbanization, 456-465
association
and inward response, 309-310
and outward response, 311-313
attitudes toward suicide, 333-334
basis for larger social organization, 74
and biological survival, 65-68
budget, Le Play's use of, 6
case study, 11-12
case-work portrayal of the, 11-12
changing character of the, 11-12

Family—*continued*
chief support of the social order, 82
childless, 25-26
Chinese, 18, 19, 128, 208-209
and the church, 286-289
compared with a cell of the body, 315
complex, the
companionship element of, 579-584
economic element of, 570-579
parenthood element of, 584-592
sexual element of, 560-570
complexity of changes in the, 559-560
composition, influences habit traits, 315-316
comradeship-aspects of the, 582-584
concept of, 3-4, 120-121
a conditioning agency, 227
conditioning, by masculine-feminine status, 271-272
contact
the significance of, 295
a special association, 302-304, 353
content of the, 17
contribution
to personality, 304
to primitive government, 200-201
to social survival, 81-82
to society, 141-142
a conventionalized ideal, 26
co-operation with other institutions, 186-187
counseling; *see* Counseling, family
criticism of the, 554-557
curriculum of the primitive, 229-230
defense of the, 466-467
definition of, 5
an economic unit, 5-8
educates through nurture, 224-225
an educating institution, 235-237
effect of industrial development on, 7-8
efficiency of primitive, 176-177
and emotional maladjustment, 358-362
an emotional refuge, 354-355, 454
emotional retardation in the, 131-132

Family—*continued*
and environment, 473-474
and environmental adjustment, 441-443, 447-448
evolution of the, 23-24
evolution of social thought concerning; *see* Social thought, evolution of
experience
and the development of religion, 278-280
and perpetuity, 121-122
and the folkways, 177-178
food ties, 88-89
as a formal institution, 180-181
function, 554-557
and future civilization, 592-594
future of the, 557-559
governmental control of services to, 592
and housing, 470-473
identity, 88
and immaterial culture, 169-172
incentives in the, 397-399
an incubator for emotion, 353-356
an incubator of personality, 21
and the individual, 304-307
individual nature of the, 4
inferiority feeling in the, 400-404
influence, and the unconscious, 174-176
instability of the American, 79
and institutional variation, 187-191
instructions to census enumerator as to definition of, 5
interaction
difference in various cultures, 295
jealousy in, 371-373
socializes as well as individualizes, 306-307
and inventions, 446-447
invitation, 350-352
judicial function of, 216-217
lessening economic significance of, 570
liabilities of, 350-352
life, education, 550-552
and maintenance of authority, 204-206
masculine code in, 269-271
and material resources, 166-169

Family—*continued*
and the mores, 178-179
motives, 24-25, 275-278
mutual relationships in, 310
need for research in, 12-13, 591-592
occupational demands upon, 474
an organization for the perpetuation of culture, 76
an outlet for self-expression, 78
perpetuity
contribution of sex to, 128-130
and environmental instability, 134-136
and immortality, 127-128
a liability, 132-134
and property, 123-127
society's use of, 122-123
points of tension, 30-31
and the power urge, 55-56
pressure for attention to the, 187
primary meaning of, 4
and primitive education, 222-223
protection against society, 578-579
provides favorable conditions for emotional development, 322-323
psychic maladjustments in the modern, 353-356
and public opinion, 212-215
and public order, 209-212
reaction to a mentally sick member, 332-333
reality, 17-23
a refuge from reality, 328
relationship to society, 16-17
and religion, 128, 273-274, 288-289
risk of small, 158-159
rural, 231-232
sensitivity to change, 450
sex education in the, 248-249
social adaptation of the, 556
a social habit, 317
social health of the, 449
a social institution, 8-9
and social introductions, 172-174
and society, 15-17, 166
sociological interpretation of the, 9-10
in sociological literature, 9-10
souche or stem type of, 90
and the state, 217-219
a statistical unit, 4-5

Family—*continued*
a subjective experience, 17
and subjective maladjustments, 356-358
support of sanctions, 210-211
and survival, 64-67, 74-77
task of the, 29
tension in the, 462-467
test of the, 320
training in the, 207, 238
the Turkish, 8-9
twofold relationship with the state, 218-219
types of, with a minimum of comradeship, 582
a universal organization, 204
unorthodox forms of the, 188
variability, 190
vitality of modern, 356
and vocational training, 230-232
Fear and dependency, 395
Feast of Lanterns, 102
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 492
Feminists, and evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 529-536
Fertility, rate of urban and rural, 467-468
Fixation, 131-132, 158, 248-249
Folklore, 234-235
Folkways, 177-178, 180-181
Food
attitude of primitive people toward, 228-229
cravings, 36-37
as illustration of conditioning, 227-229
taboos regarding, 228-229
Formal institution; *see* Institution, the formal
Foster home, 65-66, 160-161
Freud and psychoanalysis, and evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 545-546
Friendship, extra-conjugal, 581-582
Frustration, 397-398

George Junior Republic, 186
Germany, birth rate in, 468
Girl Scouts, 168
Government
basis of control in, 202-204
control of services to the family, 592
essence of, 199
an extension of the family principle, 203
function of justice in, 210
incitements toward, 209
political, 196-197
primitive, 197-199, 200-201
a social institution, 196-197, 212
Grange, the, 254
Group
attitudes used by society, 163-164
jealousy in the, 364
necessity for the, 71-72
Gua, a chimpanzee, 75

Hebrews, 47, 127
Home
and community co-existent, 80
contributions of the, 190-191, 336-339
emotional coloring of the, 335-336
influence of proximity, 92
an operating institution, 352
and the power motivation, 55-56
and religion, 61
supervision and inspection of the, 586-587
a therapeutic organization, 66
Household production, survey, 6-7
Housing, 470-473
Hypertension, 455-456

Ibos, the, 279-280
Ideal
the domestic, 319-320
the family as a conventionalized, 26
the monogamic, 562, 566
"Identical" matings, 108-109
Identification, 72, 392-393
Identity
in adoption, 102-103
assumption of, 110-112
based on confidences, 94-95
and the birth process, 85-87
close contact and feelings of, 91-92

Identity—*continued*
competition of, 104-107
consciousness of, 84-85
family, 88
in food ties, 88-89
incentive of, 84-85
kinship, 113-114
loss of, 96
in milk ties, 103
recognized by law, 96
in simple society, 87-88
in slaves of the South before the Civil War, 92
spreading of, 87
and the struggle against poverty, 90
transference of, 111
Illness, emotional hazards of, 395-397
Impulse
power motivation as a fundamental, 54
the religious, 59-60
Incentive
of identity; *see* Identity
of perpetuity; *see* Perpetuity
Incest, 107-109, 206
Individuality in the family, 307-308, 578
Industrial development, 7-8
Infancy
period, 20-21, 129-130
relationship, 147-148
two fundamental tendencies in, 361-362
Inferiority feeling
a defensive mechanism, 400-406
jealousy and, 362, 381
and marriage and the family, 400-404
Infertility, 469
Inheritance, 123
In-law relationship, 111
Instinct, concept of, 22
Institute of Sexual Science, 548
Institution
basic need of the, 191
elements of, 191
entrance of the child into, 193
the family as an educating, 235-237
the formal, 180-183, 186-187, 191-195, 237-238
Institution—*continued*
function of the, 189-190
of marriage, 47-48
perpetuation of, 189
product of will-to-live processes, 181
of religion, 274
seeks support of parents, 194
the social, 8, 195, 447, 453
variation of the, 187-191
Institutions, linkage between, 190
Interaction
compound, 311-313
as consciousness of kind, 292
contact prerequisite to, 293-295
a creative process, 305-306
individualizes as well as socializes, 306-307
meaning of, 290-291
modifies behavior, 291-292
test of, 291, 295
International Council of Religious Education, 492
Introvert, 268
Inventions
death rate of, 449-450
difficulty of predicting change due to, 452
and social adaptation, 446-447
Invitation, the family, 350-352
Italy, birth rate in, 468

Japan
ancestral loyalty in, 416-418
birth rate in, 468
family type of religion in, 128
Jealousy, 330, 362-383
adult, 377-380
analysis of, by Swedenborg, 491-492
in children, 365-367, 373-375
common incitements toward, 367-373
in courtship, 374-377
as emotion, 362-364
and inferiority feeling, 362, 381, 400-401
a liability of socialization, 363-365
and rivalry, 381
sex, 378-379
as social motivation, 380-383
socially disturbing, 380

Kinship
Chinese system contrasted with American system, 18-19
established by blood brotherhood, 100
as identity, 87-88
meaning of, 18-19
Old Testament thinking in regard to, 476
role of, in primitive government, 197-199
sex, 104-107
systems, studied by Morgan, 515

Labor, division of, 252-254, 258-260
Lag, domestic, 304-305
Lambeth Conference, 545 n.
Language, 151-153
Leadership, in primitive group, 199-200
Legal thinking, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 553
London, 457-458, 461
Looking-glass self, 526
Love
child's feeling of, 371-372
and hate inseparable, 419
Old Testament thinking in regard to, 476
parental, requires discipline, 432-433
romantic contrasted with natural, 521-522
Loyalties
and clashing of individuals, 422-423
and clashing of love and hate, 420
matrimonial, 434-439
parental clashing of, 432-434, 439-440
Loyalty
ambivalent basis of clashing, 418-420
ancestral, 414-418
of child, 408-409, 414
in China and Japan, 416-418
definition of, 407
drive for, 412-414
meaning of, 407-409
and public opinion, 414
self-directed, 411
Loyalty—*continued*
sources of, 412-413
within the family, 410-412

Magic, 80-81, 170-171, 233
Maladjustments
emotional, 358-362
psychic, 351-352
sexual, 268
subjective, 356-358
Male dominance, 256-258
Mana, 169
Maori
economic system of the, 7, 79
family and the community, 79-80
food-getting activities, 89-90
industrial training, 169
training of the child, 167, 192
Marriage
an achievement in co-operation, 76-77
beena, 515
companionate, 25, 539, 565, 583
comradeship, 583
delayed, 315-316
and dependency relationships, 397-400
and desire to confess past, 436-438
education for, 550-552
eugenic program in, 589
evolution of social thought concerning; *see* Social thought, evolution of
and inferiority feeling, 400-404
institution of, 47-48
a means of fulfilling ambition, 406
monogamic, 379-380
need for research in, 591-592
a religious sacrament, 289
and reproduction, 49-51
test of, 320
Masculine code, 269-271
Masculine-feminine status, 251-254, 256-258
Material resources, 166-169
Matings, "identical," 108-109
Medical social work, 10-11
Medicine
patent, 591
preventive, 590-591
socialization of, 590

Middletown, mobility of working class in, 135
Milk ties, identity in, 103
Mobility, urban and rural, 135
Monitorial system, 227
Monogamic
 ideal, 562, 566
 marriage, 379-380
Morbid attitude, 331-334
Mores, 178-180, 216
Mother
 -child relationship, 145-147
 love, 143-150
 vs. female, 265-267
Motivation
 familial, 24-25
 power, 54-55
 religious, 59-60
 social, 58-59
Motives
 meaning of, 32-33
 other-than-self, 142-143
 and society, 33-34
Moving pictures
 age level of greatest response to, 297
 and courtship, 296
 as cursory contact, 293-294, 296-300
 influence of, 298-299

Nairs of India, 103
National Council of Church Women, 492
National Education Association, Yearbook for 1941, 552
Navajo Indians, 444
Negro
 mobility of the, 445
 urbanization of the, 445-446
Nevada, 569
New Haven colony, regulation regarding courtship, 125-126

Oedipus complex, 370
Oneida Community, 95-96, 188, 189, 355, 411-412, 433, 585
Other-than-self motives, 142-150
Overcompensation, 401
Overprotection, 393-394

Paranoia, as escape from jealousy, 364
Parent
 chief barrier to adolescent heterosexual development, 430
 -child relationship, 132, 144-146, 186-187, 350, 358
Parental
 clashing of loyalties, 432-434
 domination, 384
 exploitation of children, 342-346
 favoritism, as a cause of jealousy, 367-368
 influence as a liability, 390-393
 policy and clashing of loyalties, 423-424
 responsibility for inferiority feeling in child, 404-405
Parenthood
 conservation of, 585-587
 element of family complex, 584-592
 illusiveness of, 439
Parents
 ambivalent attitude of child toward, 306
 separation of, 427-428
Patriarchal theory, 514
Patriotism, as a form of jealousy, 364
Perpetuity
 effect of infancy period on, 129-130
 and family experience, 121
 human craving for, 115-117
 as a human desire, 117-118
 incentive of, related to cultural wealth, 114
 parental, 132-133
 primitive expressions of, 118-121
 quest for, 121-122
 as revealed in reincarnation, 120
 through fixation, 131-132
 weakened by mobility of family, 134-136
Personality, 304, 308, 324
Phallic worship, 280-282
Phantasy play, 154
Philosophers, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 495-508
Pima father, 234
Pipiles, 281
Plains Cree prayer, 275

Play
-cravings of child, 394
impulse, the, 81-82
three kinds of, 154
and transcendency, 153-155
two aspects of, 153-154
Polynesians, 102
Population, 316-317, 456-457
Power
craving and inferiority feeling, 400-401
motivation, 54-56
Primitive education, 222-223; *see also* Education, primitive
Primitive life
emphasis on social stability in, 209-210
and perpetuity, 118-121
sex differences in, 104-105
Primitive religious system, 59-60
Property
as a family ambition, 125-126
and family perpetuity, 123-127
Prostitution, 269-271, 505
Protestant thinking regarding marriage and the family, 492-493
Psychic
drives, 34-41
mechanisms, 361
reaction, a test of adaptation, 453-454
Pubic upheaval, 346-347
Public health program, 590
Public opinion and the family, 212-215

Radicals, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 536-539
Radio, 293-294, 461
Reality of the child, 239-241
Reincarnation, 120
Relative, definition of, 206
Religion
and adolescence, 285-286
authority of, 128
and the child, 283-285
an extension of control, 274-275
familial motives for, 275-278
familial type of, 286-287
Religion—*continued*
function of, 60
and the home, 61
institution of, 274
modern incentives toward, 275-277
primitive, 59-60, 275-276
a provision for survival, 273-274
and sex worship, 282
as a shield against reality, 288-289
Religious leaders, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 476-495
Reproduction
and marriage, 49-51
and modern civilization, 467-470
and sex, 40-41
Research
in marriage and the family, 591-592
number employed by government in, 452
Resources, 169
Retreat
as a defensive mechanism, 386-394
habit of, 388
and overprotection of the child, 393-394
tests of abnormal, 387
Rivalry, 368-369, 381
Russia, divorce program in, 569

Samoan household, 262
Schizophrenia, 157, 564
School, a formal institution, 237-238
Security, demand for economic, 575-576
Self-assertion, 361-362
Self-consciousness
child's, awakening of, 356-358
and the desire for social standing, 58
in ego-survival, 71
essential liability of, 358
first awakened by family, 307
Self-expression, the family an outlet for, 78
Self-negation, 361-362
Self-preservation, 35-40
Seneca Falls Convention, 531-533

Sex
and adolescent clashing of loyalties, 429-432
antagonism, 267-268
as an aspect of the total personality, 250
attraction, 105-107, 109-110
child's attitude toward, 337
contribution to adult career, 564
contribution to family perpetuity, 128-130
degradation of, 267
education, 44-45, 245-250
as an element of the family complex, 560-570
and the endocrine system, 561
family alliance, 560-562
as hunger, 41
ignored by medical science, 563
influence of moving pictures on, 298-299
interpretation of, 564-565
kinship, 104-107
and magic in primitive life, 281
positive value of, 561
program of concealment in regard to, 430-431
and reproduction, 40-41
scientific investigation of, 563
social significance of, 566-567
status, 251-252, 263-265
strain, 567-568
sublimation of, 42-47
taboos, 46-47
worship, 282
Sexologists, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 547-549
Shivwits, 200
Social code, 261-263
Social cohesion, 57
Social habit, the family a, 317
Social institution, 8-9, 188, 196-197
Social introduction and the family, 172-174
Social investigation, 528
Social motivation, 56-59
Social organization
the family a basis for larger, 74
fundamental lag in, 194
Social self, emergence of, 73
Social standardization, 176-177
Social standing, desire for, 58-59
Social survival, 54-55, 74-77, 81-82
Social sympathy, 58-59
Social thought concerning marriage and the family, evolution of
anthropologists, 514-519
Bachofen, Johann J., 515-516
Briffault, Robert, 517-518
Maine, Sir Henry, 514
Malinowski, Bronislaw, 518-519
McLennan, John F., 514-515
Mead, Margaret, 519
Morgan, Lewis H., 514-515
Unwin, J. D., 519
Birth Control Movement, 540-545
Bradlaugh, Charles, 542
Knowlton, Dr. Charles, 542
Malthus, 540-541
modern birth control movement, 543
Noyes, John Humphrey, 542
opposition to birth control, 543-545
Owen, Robert Dale, 542
Place, Francis, 541
Sanger, Margaret, 542-543
Stopes, Marie, 542-543
Economists, the, 527-529
Engel, Christian Lorenz Ernst, 528
Engels, Frederic, 528-529
Le Play, Frédéric, 527-528
Marx, Karl, 528-529
Evolutionists, the, 508-514
Darwin, Charles, 508-509
Drummond, Henry, 511-512
Fiske, John, 513-514
Spencer, Herbert, 509-511
Feminists, the, 529-536
Civil War, results of, 533
Fuller, Margaret, 533
Key, Ellen, 534-535
Mill, John Stuart, 530-531
Seneca Falls Convention, 531-533
Stone, Lucy, 535-536
Wollstonecraft, 530
Freud and Psychoanalysis, 545-546
Hall, Granville Stanley, 546-547

Freud and Psychoanalysis—*continued*
Philosophers, the, 495-508
Aristotle, 499-500
Aurelius, Marcus, 500-501
Cicero, 500
Confucius, 495-496
Mencius, 496
Plato, 496-499
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 501-503
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 506-508
Weininger, Otto, 503-506
Radicals, the, 536-539
Bebel, August, 539
Carpenter, Edward, 537-538
Hinton, James, 536-537
Lindsey, Judge Ben B., 538-539
Owen, Robert, 539
Owen, Robert Dale, 539
Russell, Bertrand, 538
Religious leaders, 476-495
Church Fathers, the, 483-486
Jesus, 480-481
Luther, Martin, 486-489
Old Testament thinking, 476-479
present Protestant thinking, 492-493
present Roman Catholic thinking, 493-495
Saint Augustine, 485-486
Saint Paul, 481-483
Swedenborg, Emanuel, 489-492
Sexologists, the, 547-549
Dickinson, Robert L., 550
Ellis, Havelock, 547-548
Hindu erotic literature, 547
Hirschfeld, Magnus, 548
Robie, W. F., 548-550
Sociologists, the, 520-527
Comte, Auguste, 520-521
Cooley, Charles H., 526
Giddings, Franklin H., 524-525
Mead, George H., 527
Pareto, Vilfredo, 525-526
Sumner, William Graham, 523-524
Ward, Lester, 521-522
Social vestiges, 181
Social work, medical, 10-11
Socialization, 63
Society
construction of, 137-139
Society—*continued*
a continuous social process, 140-141
an extension of adjustment resources, 163-165
and the family, 15-17, 166
and motives, 33-34
origin of, 53-54
use of group attitudes by, 163-164
Sociologists, the, and the evolution of social thought concerning marriage and the family, 520-527
South Carolina, 529
Spacing of children, 365-367
Standardization, social, 176-177
State, and the family, 217-219
Status
masculine-feminine, 251-254
social, 572-575
of woman; *see* Woman, status of
Sterility, 126, 469
Sublimation, 42-47
Suffrage, woman, 532, 534-536
Suicide, attitude of family toward, 333-334
Survival
ego, 69-73
the family and, 64-67, 74-77
meaning of, 64
motive in, 62
social, 54-55, 74-77
and socialization, 63
spiritual, 116
Sympathy, social, 58-59

Taboos
concerning pregnancy, childbirth, and menstruation, 47
and control of sex, 46-47
food, 170-171, 228-229
incest, 206
Teacher, married or unmarried woman as a, 244
Tension, 30-31, 462-467
Tipi, 275
Totalitarian state, 433-434
Training, vocational, 230-232
Transcendency
failure to make, 155-156
indispensable to human social organization, 139

Transcendency—*continued*
and language, 150-153
liabilities of, 158
and play, 153-155
vicarious, 159-161
Trial marriage, 25
Trobriands, 47-48, 93, 94, 120, 226, 233, 382
Turkish family, 8-9

Unsocial attitudes, 190-191
Urbanization
effect on fertility, 470
and the family, 456-467
of the Negro, 445-446
Urge
the religious, 59-60
the social, 56-57

Vassar College, course in euthenics, 552
Vicarious transcendency, 159-161
Vocational training, 230-232

Wales, birth rate in, 468
Weaning, 131, 147
"Wen, The," 457-458
Wife, the Good, Old Testament thinking in regard to, 477
Woman
effect of reproductive processes on, 257
the married or unmarried, as a teacher, 244-245
social significance of, 261
status of, 171-172, 478, 529, 533-534, 572-575
World War of 1914-1918, 454
Worship, ancestor; *see* Ancestor worship
Worship, phallic; *see* Phallic worship
Wyandots, 255